

WIDENER



HN QBTR 4

KSF 1367 (24)



HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
OF
AMERICA

EDITED BY
CHARLES H. GRANDGENT
SECRETARY OF THE ASSOCIATION

VOL. XXIV
NEW SERIES, VOL. XVII

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE ASSOCIATION
PRINTED BY J. H. FURST COMPANY
BALTIMORE
1909

MS. A. 9.2 340 (1)

MS. F. 12.2 (1)

BOUND JAN 10 1910



CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I.—A Spanish Farce of the Early Sixteenth Century. By J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD, - - - - -	1
II.—The English Wagner Book of 1594. By ALFRED E. RICHARDE, - - - - -	32
III.— <i>Ut Pictura Poesis</i> . By WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD, - - -	40
—IV.—Chaucer's Legend of Medea. By ROBERT K. ROOT, - - -	124
V.—Browning and the Marathon Race. By JOHN W. CUNLIFFE, - - - - -	154
VI.—The Purport of Lyly's <i>Endimion</i> . By PERCY W. LONG, - - -	164
VII.—The Staging of the Court Drama to 1595. By ANNA AUGUSTA HELMHOLTZ-PHELAN, - - - - -	185
VIII.—The History of French Fable Manuscripts. By GEORGE C. KEIDEL, - - - - -	207
IX.—Some Disputed Questions in Beowulf-Criticism. By WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE, - - - - -	220
X.—Stella and the <i>Broken Heart</i> . By STUART P. SHERMAN, - - -	274
XI.— <i>Reiz ist Schönheit in Bewegung</i> . By WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD, - - - - -	286
XII.—Some Texts of Liturgical Plays. By KARL YOUNG, - - -	294
—XIII.—Fortune's Wheel in the <i>Roman de la Rose</i> . By STANLEY LEMAN GALPIN, - - - - -	332
—XIV.—Chaucer's <i>Medea</i> and the Date of the <i>Legend of Good Women</i> . By G. L. KITTREDGE, - - - - -	342
XV.—The Fisher King in the Grail Romances. By WM. A. NITZE, - - - - -	3
XVI.—The Liturgical Basis of the Towneley Mysteries. By F. W. CADY, - - - - -	419
XVII.—The Family of Maurice Scève. By JOHN L. GERIG, - - -	470
XVIII.—On the History of Palatal <i>h</i> in French with Special Reference to <i>o</i> and open <i>e</i> . By JOHN E. MATZKE, - - -	476
XIX.— <i>Ysopet III</i> of Paris. By MURRAY P. BRUSH, - - -	494
XX.— <i>Hudibras</i> in Germany. By HARVEY W. THAYER, - - -	547
XXI.—Symbolism, Allegory, and Autobiography in <i>The Pearl</i> . By WILLIAM HENRY SCHOFIELD, - - - - -	585
XXII.—A Recently Discovered Fragment of an Old French MS. of the <i>Faits des Romains</i> . By H. A. TODD, - - - - -	676
XXIII.— <i>Magnificencia Ecclesie</i> . By HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN, - - -	687
—XXIV.—A Definition of <i>Petrarchismo</i> . By JOHN M. BERDAN, - - -	699
XXV.—Source and Analogues of <i>How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad</i> . By C. R. BASKERVILL, - - - - -	711

APPENDIX.

PAGE.

Proceedings of the Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, held at Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., and at Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill., December 28, 29, 30, 1908.

THE ASSOCIATION MEETING.

Address of Welcome. By President WOODROW WILSON, - -	iv
Report of the Secretary, - - - - -	iv
Communication from the Association of American Universities, -	iv
Election of Honorary Members, - - - - -	vi
Report of the Treasurer, - - - - -	vii
Appointment of Committees, - - - - -	vi, viii
1. Chaucer's Legend of Medea. By ROBERT K. ROOT, - -	ix
2. An Unpublished Collection of Old French Fables. By MURRAY P. BRUSH, - - - - -	ix
3. Goethe's Homunculus, a Study in Faust Criticism. By KARL D. JESSEN, - - - - -	ix
4. The Results of Mrs. Macdonald's Discoveries regarding Jean Jacques Rousseau. By ALBERT SCHINZ, - - -	ix
5. The Purport of Lyly's <i>Endimion</i> . By PERCY W. LONG, -	x
6. Ælfric's Legend of St. Swithin. By GORDON HALL GEROULD, - - - - -	x
The Address of the President of the Association :	
A Plea for the Study of Medieval Latin. By FREDERICK MORRIS WARREN, - - - - -	x
7. The Poetry of Sully Prudhomme. By E. P. DARGAN, -	x
8. Milton and the Revival of the Sonnet. By RAYMOND D. HAVENS, - - - - -	xi
9. A Definition of <i>Petrarchismo</i> . By JOHN M. BERDAN, -	xi
10. <i>Chauvin</i> (<i>Chaurinisme—Calvin, Cauvin</i>) : Truth and Fiction in the Story of its Origin. By A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT,	xi
11. The Influence of Salvator Rosa in English Literature of the Eighteenth Century. By E. E. HALE, JR., - -	xii
12. Pöesneck and <i>Hermann und Dorothea</i> . By CHARLES JULIUS KULLMER, - - - - -	xii
Meeting of the Concordance Society, - - - - -	xii

CONTENTS.

v

13. French Poetry for English Readers. By BRANDER MATTHEWS, - - - - -	xiii
14. The Facts of Pierre du Ryer's Life. By H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER, - - - - -	xiii
15. The United States in European Literature. By CAMILLO VON KLENZE, - - - - -	xiii
16. The Beginnings of Byronism in Spain. By PHILIP H. CHURCHMAN, - - - - -	xiv
17. The Moors in Spanish Popular Poetry before 1600. By WILLIAM WISTAR COMFORT. - - - - -	xiv
Meeting of the American Dialect Society, - - - - -	xiv
Report of Committee on the Reproduction of Early Texts, - - -	xv
Report of Committee of Fifteen, - - - - -	xvi
Appointment of Committee to consult with Carnegie Institution, -	xvii
Resolution on the Tariff, - - - - -	xviii
Appointment of Committee on Publications, - - - - -	xviii
Report of Auditing Committee, - - - - -	xix
Report of Nominating Committee, - - - - -	xix
Resolution of Thanks, - - - - -	xix
18. A Recently Discovered Fragment of an Old French Life of Julius Cæsar. By HENRY A. TODD, - - - - -	xx
19. 'Amore e Monna Lagia e Guido ed Io': A New Interpretation of the Sonnet by Guido Cavalcanti. By JAMES E. SHAW, - - - - -	xx
20. <i>Beowulf</i> and the <i>Saga of Hrolf Kraki</i> . By WILLIAM W. LAWRENCE, - - - - -	xx
21. The First Book Printed in England and its Source. By ERNEST F. LANGLEY, - - - - -	xxi
22. The Influence of the Translation Technique of J. H. Voss on Goethe's Hexameter. By CLARENCE W. EASTMAN, -	xxi
23. Fortune's Wheel in the <i>Roman de la Rose</i> . By STANLEY L. GALPIN, - - - - -	xxi
24. The <i>Fabliau</i> in English Literature. By G. H. MCKNIGHT, -	xxii
25. The Collaboration of Webster and Dekker. By FREDERICK E. PIERCE, - - - - -	xxii
26. Tennyson's <i>Idylls of the King</i> as Epic and as Drama. By PERCY A. HUTCHISON, - - - - -	xxii
27. A Prospective Edition of the <i>Chanson de Roland</i> . By F. B. LUQUIENS, - - - - -	xxiii
Papers read by Title, - - - - -	xxiv

THE CENTRAL DIVISION MEETING.

Appointment of Committees, - - - - -	xxviii
1. Repetition in Chaucer and Shakespeare. By ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND, - - - - -	xxviii
2. The Bleeding Lance, the Grail and Irish Saga. By ARTHUR C. L. BROWN, - - - - -	xxix
3. Were the Coventry Pageants Stationary or Processional? By FRANCES CAMPBELL BERKELEY, - - - - -	xxix
4. Wilhelm Heinse and the Romantic School. By JOSEF WIEHR, - - - - -	xxix
5. Contemporary Estimates of the <i>Gettysburg Address</i> . By DANIEL KILHAM DODGE, - - - - -	xxx
6. The Historical Drama in the French Literature of Louisiana. By EDWARD J. FORTIER, - - - - -	xxx
Address of Welcome. By Dean THOMAS F. HOLGATE, - -	xxx
Address of the Chairman of the Division :	
The American Scholar and the Modern Languages. By OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON, - - - - -	xxx
7. Notes on the Don Quijote. By FRANK OTIS REED, - -	xxxi
8. The Meaning of Law in Language. By GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP, - - - - -	xxxi
9. Geibels Nachahmung der <i>Banks and Braes o' Bonnie Doon</i> . By OTTO HELLER, - - - - -	xxxi
10. Browning and the Marathon Race. By JOHN WILLIAM CUNLIFFE, - - - - -	xxxii
11. The Meaning of Walther's <i>Spruch</i> 82, 11-25 (ed. Wil- manns ²). By STARR WILLARD CUTTING, - - - - -	xxxii
12. The Versification of Tennyson's Early Poems. By J. F. A. PYRE, - - - - -	xxxii
13. Poetry and the Practical Man. By HARRY TORSEY BAKER,	xxxii
Departmental Meetings :—	
English, - - - - -	xxxiv
Germanic Languages, - - - - -	xxxiv
Romance Languages, - - - - -	xxxv
Report of Nominating Committee, - - - - -	xxxvi
Report of Committee on Place of Meeting, - - - - -	xxxvii
Resolutions, - - - - -	xxxvii

CONTENTS.

vii

Report of Committee on Reproduction of Early Texts,	- -	xxxviii
14. The Staging of the Court Drama up to 1595. By ANNA HELMHOLTZ-PHELAN,	- - - - -	xxxix
15. The Boulogne Manuscript of the <i>Chevalerie Vivien</i> . By RAYMOND WEEKS,	- - - - -	xl
16. An Eighteenth Century attempt at a Critical View of the Novel,— <i>Bibliothèque Universelle des Romans</i> . By JOHN MANTEL CLAPP,	- - - - -	xl
17. The Bicentennial of Albrecht von Haller. By JULIUS GOEBEL,	- - - - -	xli
18. Celtic Stories in the Basque Country. By PHILIP WARNER HARRY,	- - - - -	xli
19. The Liturgic Easter Drama. By NEIL C. BROOKS,	- -	xli
20. Resuscitation in Popular Literature : a Chapter in the Study of Popular Tale, Ballad, and Drama. By ARTHUR BEATTY,	- - - - -	xli
21. Origin of the <i>Légende du beau Pécopin et de la belle Bauldour</i> . By ARTHUR GRAVES CANFIELD,	- - - - -	xlii
22. Hauptmann's View-Point in <i>Und Pippa tanzt</i> . By PAUL H. GRUMMANN,	- - - - -	xlii
23. <i>Le Joyeulx Mistere des Trois Rois, par Jehan d'Abundance</i> . By DAVID HOBART CARNAHAN,	- - - - -	xliii
24. Luther's Translation of Job. By WARREN WASHBURN FLOBER and E. H. LAUER,	- - - - -	xliii
25. The Relation of Browning's <i>Luria</i> to Shakespeare's <i>Othello</i> . By GEORGE R. ELLIOTT,	- - - - -	xliii
Papers Read by Title,	- - - - -	xliv
Address of the President of the Association :		
A Plea for the Study of Medieval Latin. By FREDERICK MORRIS WARREN,	- - - - -	xlvi
Address of the Chairman of the Central Division :		
The American Scholar and the Modern Languages. By OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON,	- - - - -	lxxiii
Officers of the Association,	- - - - -	cii
The Constitution of the Association,	- - - - -	civ
List of Members,	- - - - -	cviii
List of Subscribing Libraries,	- - - - -	cli
Honorary Members,	- - - - -	cliv
Roll of Members Deceased,	- - - - -	clv

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
OF
AMERICA

EDITED BY
CHARLES H. GRANDGENT

SECRETARY OF THE ASSOCIATION

VOL. XXIV, NO. 1
NEW SERIES, VOL. XVII, NO. 1
MARCH, 1909

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE ASSOCIATION
AT 107 WALKER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
BOSTON POSTAL DISTRICT
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$3.00 A YEAR; SINGLE NUMBERS \$1.00
PRINTED BY J. H. FURST COMPANY
BALTIMORE

Entered November 7, 1902, at Boston, Mass., as second-class matter
under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

I.—A Spanish Farce of the Early Sixteenth Century. By J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD, - - - - -	1-31
II.—The English Wagner Book of 1594. By ALFRED E. RICHARDS, - - - - -	32-39
III.— <i>Ut Pictura Poesis</i> . By WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD, - - - - -	40-123
IV.—Chaucer's Legend of Medea. By ROBERT K. ROOT, - - - - -	124-153
V.—Browning and the Marathon Race. By JOHN W. CUNLIFFE, - - - - -	154-163
VI.—The Purport of Lyly's <i>Endimion</i> . By PERCY W. LONG, - - - - -	164-184

The annual volume of the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* is issued in quarterly instalments. It contains chiefly articles which have been presented at the meetings of the Association and approved for publication by the Editorial Committee. Other appropriate contributions may be accepted by the Committee. The closing number of each volume includes, in Appendices, the Proceedings of the last Annual Meeting of the Association and its Divisions.

The complete sets of the first seven volumes of these Publications are all sold. The subsequent volumes, comprising all the New Series, may be obtained of the Secretary. The subscription for the current volume is \$3.00. The price of single numbers is \$1.00 each.

Copies of the Report of the Committee of Twelve on Admission Requirements may be obtained of the Secretary. The price is ten cents a copy.

All communications should be addressed to

CHARLES H. GRANDGENT,
Secretary of the Association,
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

The next Annual Meeting of the Association will be held at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., on December 28, 29, and 30. The Central Division Meeting will be held at the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., on the same days. Attention is called to the regulations printed on the third page of this cover.

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
Modern Language Association of America.
1909.

VOL. XXIV, 1.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XVII, 1.

I.—A SPANISH FARCE OF THE EARLY
SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

This farce, which is here published for the first time, is found in a collection of manuscript poetry in the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid with the press mark 2621. It bears number 1239 in Sr. Paz y Melia's catalogue of plays in the Biblioteca Nacional.¹ The handwriting is of the early sixteenth century. The volume contains poems, for the most part anonymous, of the sixteenth century, in Castilian and Catalan. On the first page, in a hand of the seventeenth century, we read: "En este libro ay poesias de Jorge de Montemayor, de Juan Fernandez, de D. Luis Margarit, de D. Luis de Milan, de D. Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, de N. Torrellas, de D. Hernando de Acuña, de Alvaro Gomez de Ciudad Real y de otros autores inciertos."

The farce is found on fols. 123-146, and is anonymous. It is probable that the author is Don Luis Margarit. All the poetry preceding the farce is likewise anonymous. Immediately following it we find:

¹ *Catálogo de las piezas de teatro que se conservan en el departamento de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional.*

Fol. 148-150 : " Carta al almirante de Castilla."

Fol. 150-151b : " Respuesta al almirante de Castilla."

Fol. 152-153 : " A un cauallero mal aromançado en lenga (*sic*) castellana hizo a una cuera de cuero que traya don Joan fernandez esse villancico al qual respondio la respuesta al pie del villancico,

Si se passa este galan."

Fol. 153b-155 : " Haze el mesmo don Luys margarit otras coplas a una cuera que don Joan traya de terciopelo diziendo que hauer en ungria y alemana tantas cueras no se houieran perdido responde a esto don Joan con otras coplas diziendo de como el dicho don luys margarit salio a recibir el duque de segorbe,

El duque diz que se espera."

Whether the expression *el mesmo don Luys Margarit*, refers to all the poetry immediately preceding, as well as to the farce, it is difficult to say, but what little evidence we have points to him as author of the farce here published.

The plot of the play is summed up in a sort of introduction which precedes the prologue and from which we learn that it was written to be represented before the " Reina Germana " and the " Marques de Brandanburch." As was pointed out by Barrera in the manuscript additions to his own copy of the *Catálogo del teatro antiguo español*, preserved in the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid, this helps us to fix the date of the play. " La Reina Germana " was Germaine de Foix, a niece of Louis XII, who married Ferdinand the Catholic, King of Aragon, in 1505. The latter died in 1516, and the Queen married John of Brandenburg, Governor of Valencia, in 1519. The Marquis of Brandenburg died in 1522, and Germaine de Foix later married as third husband Ferdinand of Aragon, Duke of Calabria.

Barrera dates the play between 1516 and 1522, that is, between the death of Ferdinand the Catholic and the death

of the Marquis of Brandenburg. But lines 13-14 of the prologue:

Que ansi hos a juntado Dios
Tan en uno

show clearly that the play was written after the marriage of Germaine de Foix and the Marquis of Brandenburg, and before the latter's death, that is, between 1519 and 1522.

Luis Margarit, or whoever the author may be, was then a contemporary of Torres Naharro, and this farce has many points in common with his plays. The dialogue is brisk and full of witty repartee. It is written in Castilian and Valencian, and a Portuguese adds another element to this linguistic medley. The literary value of the farce is not great, but it is interesting as one of the earliest dramatic efforts in Spain, and also for the material it offers for the study of life in Valencia in the early sixteenth century. I have preserved in every case the orthography of the manuscript, except that abbreviations such as *vñō*, *cō*, *quiē*, *m.* for *merced*, have been written in full. I have also used punctuation marks to facilitate the reading, though no accents have been introduced. The text, however, is corrupt, and far from clear at times. The author's knowledge of Portuguese seems to have been rather uncertain, though this may be due to the scribe.

Esta es farça hecha a manera de visita de las damas valençianas, hizola para representar delante la Reyna Germana y el Marques de Brandanburch por cuyo ruego se hizo. Introduzense çinco caualleros Fernandes, Rodrigo, Miguel, Alonso, Portugues, y çinco damas de quien son seruidores Maria, Lucrecia, Beatriz, Anna. La otra es la señora de la casa adonde se viene a hazer la visita. Tiene una dueña que se llama Guzman y una moça que se llama Catalina. Embiale Maria ques tia de la señora un capellan llamado Mossen Joan, si terna por bien que ella con las otras damas vayan

a vesitarla y un Rey de armas que en lo mejor de la fiesta entra a desafiar de parte de otros cinco caualleros, los caualleros enamorados. Acabase con el torneo de los Desafiados.

TEXT.

Las manos y pies besemos
 A tal Reyna y tal señora
 Que nos haze cada ora
 Mas mercedes que queremos.
 Bien es que la mano pida 5
 Al señor Marques tambien,
 Que quien no le quiere bien,
 Le quiere mas que a su vida.

Que yo sin yerro ni vicio
 La quiero siendo muger, 10
 Como le deue querer
 Quien quiere vuestro seruicio;
 Que ansi hos a juntado Dios
 Tan en uno que ninguno
 Que quiera, si quiere el uno, 15
 Ya sabe que son los dos.

Son dos, son uno, son ciento,
 Y çient mil personas son
 Para nuestra redempcion
 Con su real regimiento. 20
 ¡Que de bienes regebimos!
 ¡Que de mercedes deuemos!
 Son tantas que nos corremos
 De lo poco que seruimos.

Aunque este seruicio, creo, 25
 Que fuera para preçiar,

- Si se pudiera cortar
Ha medida del desseo.
Mas puede bien, en verdad,
Si corta viene la hobra, 30
Añyaderse con la sobra
De la mucha voluntad.
- Cap. ¿ Quien esta alla ?
Guz. ¿ Quien vay ?
Cap. Asomaos y verlo eys.
Guz. Reuerendo ¿ que quereys ? 35
Cap. A la señora dezi
Que embia mi señora
A saber que tal esta,
Y si huelga que verna
A vesitarla.
- Guz. En buen ora. 40
- ¿ Que señora le dire,
Reuerendo, que hos enbia ?
Cap. Dezi que doña Maria,
La tia de su merge(d).
Guz. Mejor que me perdone Dios, 45
Que os havia conosciendo.
Cap. Mayor yerro huuiera sido
Desconosçeros a vos.
- Y conosçeros mayor,
Pues no pudo conosçeros 50
Quien no muere por quereros.
- Guz. Dexaos desso. Entra, señor.
No soy dessas que pensays,
Que hazeys burla de mi.
No menfreno por ay. 55
Cap. Antes hos desenfrenays.

- Guz. Entrad, que nos sentiran.
Acaba ya, si quereys.
- Cap. Ya entro. Nos enojeys.
- Sra. Be siau vengut, mossen Juan, 60
¿Portau alguna enbaxada
De res que ajau menester?
- Cap. No mas de solo saber,
Si sale de la posada.
- 65
Mi señora quiere vella,
Y otras damas que alli estan;
Y si no sale, vernan
Todo el dia astar con ella.
- Sra. ¿No sab ma señora tia 70
Que encara que agues de anar,
O dexare per gozar
De tan bona compañía?

Queda la señora sola.

Ya no se quina paçencia
Basta pera comportar
Tant de negre vesitar 75
Com hara se husa en Valencia.
Nunca gent tan importuna
E vist, que no so señora
En ma casa sols un hora
Dentendre en cosa nenguna. 80

Com los portadors nols fugen,
Y elles quines comes tenen,
Y nunca veuhén que venen
Sino a visites que enugen.
Guzmana, digaume vos, 85

- ¿Nou teniu per marauella?
 ¿Usas res de aço en Castella?
 Guz. No, ¡Jhs! ¡Guardenos Dios!

 Pues ver el retraymiento
 Que tienen, no es de creer; 90
 Su vida, su tracto y ser
 Es cosa de encantamiento.
 Sra. Tanben fan negres y amargues.
 Guz. En Castilla no, en verdad.
 ¿O ques ver su grauedad! 95
 Sra. Si, de vels y faldes llargues.

 Guz. Aca azense conciencia
 De tenellas por galanas.
 Sra. Bens paren las castellanas,
 Mas passades per València. 100
 Guz. Doquiera ay malos y buenos.
 Sra. No, mas digau veritat.
 Usen poch la netedat.
 Guz. No de afeytarse a lo menos.

 Sra. Veure lo calçar de alla, 105
 ¿Quan bruta cosa di(u)gues!
 Guz. Trahen lo cuzio en los pies,
 No en el rostro como aca.
 Sra. ¿Com vos allargau, Guzmanas!
 Poch a poch vos sobrexiu. 110
 Com se mostra que teniu
 La llengua ben castellana.

 ¿Ves may la villana porca!
 Estos castellans horats
 Presumen senthuns pesats 115

Mes que Rodrigo en la forca.
 Guz. ¡Jhs, cuytada de mi!
 Pues an aqui donde estoy,
 Si bien supiese quien soy,
 No me trataria ansi. 120

Sra. Anau, que nou vull saber.

Guz. Sera por tratarme mal.

Sra. ¡O que cosa tan bestial
 Es lo castella grosser!

Guz. Señora.

Sra. Nom digau res. 125
 Cathalina, Cathalina,
 Cridaume aquexa fadrina.
 Guz. Dios lo sabe si lo es.

¡Ay Dios me torne a Castilla!
 Cathalina, Cathalina.

Cat. ¿Quien me llama? 130

Guz. Esta loca de nuestrama,
 Que no ay quien pueda gofrilla,
 Ques una cosa salvaje.

Cat. Como, ¿que rrinyo con vos?

Guz. Si, que no la medre Dios, 135
 Porque toco en mi linaje.

Haunque yo voy por aca
 Siruiendo, mas quella valgo.
 Cat. Y yo no soy hija dalgo 140
 De los mejores de alla;
 De mi madre no se nada,
 Mas se poco mas o menos
 Ques mi padre de los buenos
 Que ay en toda Granada.

- Guz. Sy yo en mi linaje entrase, 145
De grandes de mucha cuenta,
De veynte cuentos de renta
En tres dias no acabase;
Echa, d ame aca esa mano.
Mas te juro, Catalina, 150
Ques el duque de Medina
Pariente mio cercano.
- Y pues siendo yo la que digo,
Tratarme como una perra,
Diziendo mal de mi tierra, 155
“  Quien puede viuir conmigo?”
Asco te tomara en vella.
Su negra Valen ia yguala
Con Castilla;   enoramala!
- Cat.   Mala sea para ella, 160
Y aun para quien mas la quiere!
  No dezis amen, Guzmanana?
- Guz. Nunca yo vea manyana
Si mas con ella estuuiere.
- Cat.   Dixistesle cosa alguna, 165
Como soys muy reaguda?
- Guz. No fue sino que sin duda,
No estaua llena la luna.
- Pues oyr sus badajadas,
Su locura y presum ion, 170
Dezir quen Castilla son
Todas suzias, desgraciadas.
- Cat. Y ella quel vestir que trae,
Esperays que le pregone,
Y todo quanto se pone, 175
Pare e que se le cae.

- Guz. Pues de hermosa no reniega,
Si yo tan adreçada fuesse,
Bien le haria que viesse
Su ballesta donde llega. 180
Y aun si vamos alguna ora
Por esas calles, veras
Dezir que querrian mas
La duenya que la señora.
- Sra. Nunca que vingau les dos, 185
Digau a que sou anada.
- Guz. Fuy a llamar su criada.
- Sra. ¡Bèn criada axi com vos!
- Guz. Vuestra merced me persigue
Que no se puede sufrir. 190
- Sra. Vine tu, si as de venir.
Donam recapte quem lligue.
- Digues, truja descuydada,
¡No as sentit tocar tres hores?
Si venen exes senores, 195
¡Vols quem troben deslligada?
- Cat. ¡Que tengo de aparejar?
- Sra. Com en axo estas encara,
Lespill y lo drap de cara,
La caxeta de lligar. 200
- Les pinçes y lo pelador
Me porta pera pelarme,
Sabonet pera scurarme,
Blanquet y tambe color.
Dali, traume aquell capell, 205
Los canonets peral coll,
Un poch doli y lalcopholl,
Que no tinch gracia sensell.

- Digues, ¿tinch los cabells plans?
- Cat.** Si, señora.
- Sra.** Crech que ments. 210
- Portam poluora de dents,
Y grexet pera les mans.
- Cat.** Diga si otra cosa falta.
- Sra.** Los guants y tamb'el ventall.
¡Ay! esperat, que altrem fall, 215
Pegadet pera la galta.
- Not estigues, Cathalina,
Que tots temps ho fas axi.
Trauras lo mart gebeli
Quem han portat de Medina. 220
Moriamen de desig,
Mas be esta en mes del que creu;
Beli costa al señor meu
Mes de tres ducats y mig.
- Dali, ¿ves estat alla 225
Oblidat que as de venir?
- Cat.** ¡Que ceuo para renyir!
- Sra.** ¿Que dius?
- Cat.** Digo que ya
- ¡Que diablo de muger [Aparte]
Es esta que nunca calla!, 230
Que si no rinye, no halla
Que pueda tomar plazer.
- Sra.** Digau que vinga, que esclate.
- Guz.** Catalina.
- Cat.** Dexala ladre.
- Despaçio me hizo mi padre, 235
Y ¿quereys vos que me mate?

- Sra. Aço comportau ningú.
Vellaca, ¿ no acabaras?
- Cat. Señora, no puedo mas.
- Sra. Guarda yo no vaja a tu. 240
- Guz. ¡ Que donosa gracia tiene!
Date prissa, acaba ayna,
Por tu vida, Cathalina.
Ya señora, luego viene.
- Sra. ¿ No vols que acabem encara? 245
¿ On es laygua y sabonet?
- Cat. Tome ya.
- Sra. ¡ Quin drap tan net,
Axi com la tua cara!
- Nom vull huy pintar, Guzmanana,
Per que vejau que sabem 250
En València, quant volem,
Parer be a la castellana.
- Guz. Tal sea, ausadas, mi vida,
Como sin pintar este.
- Sra. Mas digau, per vostra fe, 255
¿ Nous par quem so aflaquida?
- Guz. No, señora, en mi conciencia.
Tal este qual esta, ausadas.
Mira de gordas lisiadas
Las mas damas de Valencia. 260
- Sra. Besta la carn sobrels osos.
- Guz. Mas no tanta.
- Sra. ¡ Guay de vos!
Si us oysen mes de dos,
Menjar vos yen a mossos.

- Guz. Mas no conosce que estan 265
 Algunas dellas contrechas,
 De gordas atunas hechas,
 Que me espanto como van.
- Sra. Tambe dech estar guastada
 Als vuestres ulls en bonora. 270
- Guz. Si fuesse menos, señora,
 No se perderia nada.
- Sra. Y vos, ¿nous deueu mirar
 Quan seca estau y perduda?
- Guz. Con todo, quiero sin duda 275
 Mas toçer que no sudar.
- Sra. Toçiu fins que esclateu.
 ¿Que gesto y gracia de dona!
 Altra cosa que persona
 Volgue fer Deu quant vos feu. 280
- ¿Eyx estrado esta adobat?
- Cat. Si, señora.
- Sra. Yol vull veure.
 Porta coxins pera seure.
 Jals te avies oblidat.
 Nunca saps fer res adretes. 285
 No ta dad Deu mes çeruell.
- ¿Ausades y quin parell
 De duenya y moça tan netes!
- Estes dames pera mi
 No crech que puguen tardar. 290
 Yxca la huna a mirar.
- Guz. Ya, señora, son aqui.
- Sra. Ay señores, tant de be.
 ¿Quin dia es aquest tant bo!

- Bea. A nosaltres toca axo. 295
 Sra. ¡Sus, vaja, vostra merce!
- Bea. Vostra merce a de passar.
 Sra. Millor me perdone Deu.
 Que passe.
- Bea. Vos passareu.
 Sra. Quen ma casam vol forçar, 300
 Tan mal criada ha de ser.
- Bea. Ans es fer lo que es raho.
 Sra. ¡Sus, vaja!
 Bea. Que pase yo,
 Tots temps restara per fer.
- Sra. Mal goig que veja de mi 305
 Si yo passe.
- Bea. Axo es millor.
 Si Deu me preste al señor
 Que yo no passe de açi.
- Sra. Axi vol quens estigam.
 Maria. ¡Ara, sus, señores mies! 310
 Dexemnos de cortesies.
 Anemnos com nos estam.
- Sra. Seguense vostres merces.
 ¡Sus!, que axo sera millor.
- Lucre. ¡Ay, Jhs, quina calor! 315
 Yom sech que no y puch fer mes.
- Sra. Bien sera que traygan sillas.
 Fer. Nosotros no nos sentamos.
 Sra. Que si.
 Fer. Muy mejor estamos
 Que sentados, de rodillas. 320

L. 307 el señor?

- Sra. Que quieran estar con pena,
No se deue consentir.
- Fer. ¿ Quien ha de querer viuir
Sin ella siendo tan buena?
- Sra. No entiendo essa algarauia. 325
- Fer. Pues no ay mucho que hazer.
- Sra. O no la quiero entender.
- Fer. Es por mas desdicha mia.
- Sra. Vostra merçe jam perdona,
Que si no la he visitada, 330
Tan dolentam so trobada.
- Lu. ¡ Deu la guart! La mostra es bona.
¿ Y vostra merçed, señora?
- Sra. Pera seruir la qual veu.
- Lu. ¡ Tan gentil guardela Deu! 335
- Sra. Se della ques burladora.
- De vostra merçe no cal
Demanar que tal esta,
Per que en ella se mostra ya.
- Ma. Ans de veres que stich mal. 340
- Sra. Nos mal lo mal que nos mostra.
- Bea. Maça es çert, ans es axi.
- Ma. Que jas vol burlar de mi.
- Bea. No fas, per ma vida y vostra
- Sra. Sa merced, señora mia, 345
Me diga com ses trobada.
- Bea. Mig mortam te acabada
Esta negra melerchia.
- Sra. Molt es cruel mal y fort,
Encara que no es plangut. 350
- Ma. Beuse yo que ne tengut
Que ma portat a la mort.

- Ro. Si a queixar males andamos,
Bien sera que no callemos,
Pues por mucho que quexemos, 355
Mucho por queixar dexamos.
- Ma. ¿Que males tan encubiertos
Son esos de que os quexais?
Buenos y gordos estais.
- Ro. Mas inchados ya de muertos. 360
- Lu. ¡Los muertos fablan! Os pido,
No medre quien tal creyere.
- Miguel. ¿No es mas que muerto quien quiere
Morir porque no es querido?
- Lu. Creydo direys mejor. 365
¿Quey diuen vostres merçes?
- Sra. ¿Que? Que no se pot dir mes.
- Ma. Penjat que sia el millor.
- Ro. Si al mejor an de ahorcar,
Yo me doy por aorcado. 370
- Fer. No so yo tambien criado,
Que dexase ese lugar.
- Alonso. Pues conmigo, ¿quien se yguala
En cosa de bien querer?
- Mig. Quien aqui no piensa ser 375
El primero de lescala.
- Sra. Si essa mercaderia
La traeys para vender,
Bien se sabe encareçer,
Mas yo no la mercaria. 380
- Ma. Molt sufisticada esta.
- Lu. Si no, mirau qui la porta.
- Bea. Venent ab ram a la porta,
¿Qui no la conexera?

- Alo. Pues no es muy bien conosciada 385
 De quien es tan mal tratada,
 Que áunques por mala pagada,
 Por mas que buena es tenida.
- ¿ Que sperança de consuelo
 Con quien hyla tan delgado, 390
 Que aun a cauallo dado,
 Le quiere mirar el pelo?
- Bea. Pues por ser dado, esta claro
 Que se deue mas mirar,
 Pues que se merca en tomar, 395
 Con honrra miran si es caro.
- Alo. Que no esta sino en ventura,
 Y quien tal, ninguna alcança.
 Tener de vida esperança,
 Es sin duda gran locura. 400
- Bea. Mayor seria creeros;
 Mas dezinos, si quereys,
 Si algun buen juego sabeys.
- Alo. Yo no se sino quereros.
- Bea. ¡ Que importuno estays y frio! 405
- Alo. Pues yo no siento esse mal.
- Bea. Mas bien sentis que estays tal,
 Que jugais al desuario.
- Sra. A las verdades juguemos.
- Alo. Aqui no quieren hoyllas. 410
- Lu. Pues sea a las marauillas.
- Ma. Ese es bueno. Començemos.
- Portug. Ollay, damas con razan,
 Galantes ollay, que dama!

Eu galante que mays ama 415
De quantos galantes san.

Ollay, que beyn coñoci
Si yssas damas nan san cortas,
Ya fican dembidia mortas
De vos y ellas de mi. 420

Sra. Que bona venguda es esta.
Bens fa desijar mil hores.

Ana. No se an de moure, Senyores,
Per tan chich sant tan gran festa.

Un poch me dech ser tardada. 425

Sra. Per çert ja nou fia be.

Ana. Perdonem vostra merçe,
Quem so seyta mal criada.

¡Ves may quin descuyt lo meu!

Lu. Ab mi vol ser tan cumplida 430
Que nos moga per sa vida.

Ana. No fare si majut Deu.

Yo no vinch a destorbar.

¡Sus! tornen en lo questauen.

Digaume quin joch jugauen. 435

Sra. Molt gentil, sil vol jugar,
Al joch de les marauelles

Ana. Nol se.

Sra. No y a res que fer.

Ana. Juguem, que nol vull saber.
Fare lo que faran elles. 440

L. 415. The meaning of this line is not clear. Read sou galante?

L. 428 seyta?

- Lu.** Ells tenen de començar.
- Mig.** En ser juego de plazer,
 No le avemos de saber
 En nuestra vida jugar;
 Mas por no ser mal criado 445
 Con quien tengo de servir,
 Comenzare de dezir
 De que estoy marauillado.
- No estareys marauillados
 Que yo lo este de dos cosas, 450
 De ver damas tan hermosas
 Y galanes tan penados.
- Lu.** Marauillome, veamos,
 Pues desso os marauillays,
 De vossotros que creays 455
 Que nossotras os creamos.
- Ro.** De marauillado loco
 Estoy ques cosa despanto
 Que quieran los hombres tanto,
 Y las mugeres tan poco. 460
- Ma.** Con mucha mayor razon
 Estoy yo marauillada
 Que quieran poco ni nada
 A hombres, siendo quien son.
- Alo.** Marauillome ques tal 465
 Vuestra condicion con quien
 Muere por quereros bien,
 Y vos por quererle mal.
- Bea.** Por esso es bien que sepays
 Quan marauillada quedo 470
 De mi mesma, en ver que puedo
 Çufriros que me querays.

- Por. Marauillome, donzella,
De vossa graça tamaña;
Pode ser mahor fazaña 475
Moreus homens per ella.
- Ana. Una marauilla, çierto,
Tengo por de las mayores,
De tantos muertos damores,
Nunca ver ninguno muerto. 480
- Por. ¡O corpo de Deus con vos!
Eu san biuo, nan ollays.
- Ana. Tan biuo y tan bueno estays
Ques de dar gracias a Dios.
- Por. Anday, que yssu e malicia 485
Muyto grande que dizeys.
- Ma. Buelua el juego si quereys,
Pues no os han de hazer justicia.
- Fer. Marauillome de verme
Con tanto contentamiento, 490
Tan perdido y tan contento
Que supe tan bien perderme.
- Sra. Marauillome de vos,
Pues tan contento biuis,
Como siempre me pidis 495
Como quien pide por Dios.
- Fer. Porque la neçessidad
Con que me teneys es tal,
Que yo queriendome mal,
Me lloro de piedad. 500
Que a lleuarme con un guante,

L. 476. For morrer os homens ?

- Mostrandome por ay,
Pueden bien ganar con mi
Mas que con un elefante.
- Mas todo es bien empleado, 505
Viendome que tal os veo.
- Sra. Dexaos desso que nos creo,
Que no estays enamorado.
- Fer. ¡O triste de mi, mesquino,!
Si cosa es de hauer empacho, 510
Ver un hombre mas borracho
De amores que no de vino.
- Sra. Baste, no se hable mas
En esta burla de amores.
¡ Quieren, pues ay tanyedores, 515
Que andemos un contrapas?
- Ma. Contrapas no, per sa fe,
Que en ell nom se donar mañya.
- Sra. ¡ Y en la dança de alemañya?
- Ma. Exa si.
- Ro. Pues Juan, tanye. 520
- Mig. Bien tanyen en gran manera.
- Sra. Lleuemnos, anem, señora.
- Lu. Ella ques gran dançadora,
Que guie y vaja primera.
- Sra. Anem, que per mi diran 525
Que quando los çiegos guian
- Fer. Mas çiegos se que serian
Los quen veros no ciegaran.
- Sra. Tots temps estau burlador.
- Fer. No estoy, sino muy burlado, 530

- Y ciego de enamorado
De quien no me tiene amor.
- Sra. ¿ Com sabeu vos ques axi?
¿ Qui us o a dit per vostra vida?
- Fer. Yo en nunca veros seruida, 535
En quanto os siruo de mi.
- Bea. De nouios anam a misa.
Alo. ¡ Pluuiesse a Dios que ansi fuesse!
Bea. Señora, ¿ quien se le creyese?
Alo. ¿ Que dize?
Bea. Que se den prisa. 540
Alo. Daos mas priessa en el tanyer.
Ya burlays de mi casar.
¿ Que cosa para burlar!
Bea. Mas que cosa de creher.
- Ma. Cansada estoy y perdida. 545
Ro. Pues ¡ sus! que callen los sones,
Y baylaran a canciones.
Ma. Si señor, por vostra vida.
Ro. ¿ Oys lo, que no tañgays?
Que quieran baylar cantando. 550
Alo. Nosotros baylar llorando,
Sera mejor que digays.
- Ro. Quien primero sea cansado,
A primero de cantar.
Ma. Perdido por hordenar 555
Soys en ser desordenado.
- Sra. De axo no teniu raho,
Que raho te que canteu,
Pues tan gentilment ho feu.
- Ma. Ay, señora, bo es axo. 560

Estich tan encadarnada
 Que apenas podre parlar.
 Ro. Cante ya, quen su cantar
 No se paresçera nada.
 Pues que por hoyros muero, 565
 Yo os suplico que canteys.
 Ma. Por que no me importuneys,
 Vamos ya, que cantar quiero.

Villançico.

¿Que me quereis, cauallero?
 Casada soy, marido tengo. 570
 Soy casada y tan contenta
 Con tanta razon de sello,
 Que no tengo en lo que huello
 El mal que por mi se sienta.
 Si me quereys, sea a cuenta 575
 Que nos quexey's si no os quiero,
 Casada soy, marido tengo.

Villançico.

Ro. Ahunque mas seays casada,
 No vos dexare de amar.
 Si soys casada, pensad 580
 Que si vos lo soys de grado,
 Con mas voluntad casado
 Soy yo con mi voluntad.
 Y aunque mas sin piedad
 Me querays desconfiar, 585
 No vos dexare de amar.

Lu. Dezi si sabeys a quien
 Toca de cantar agora.

Mig. A vuestra merçe, señora,
Que lo sabe hazer muy bien. 590

Lu. ¡ Maldito el cantar que se!
¿ Teney's alguno sobrado?

Mig. Que ya le terna pensado.

Lu. Amor falço cantare.

Villançico.

Amor falso, 595
Pusisteme en cuydado,
Y agora fallecisteme.

¿ A que cuenta me dezi,
Falso amor, desamorado,
Me pusistes en cuydado, 600
Sin vos tenelle de mi?
Si en algo creys que os serui,
Pagame en dezir porque
Agora fallecisteme.

Villançico.

Mig. Fallecisteme, señora, 605
Vos a mi,
Que ýo nunca os falleçi.

Y pues vos me falleçistes,
Muy marauillado esto
Que os marauilleys que yo 610
Haga lo que vos hezistes.
¡ Que buen seruidor perdistes!
Yo no se lo que perdi;
Se que nunca os falleçi.

Alo. Ya podeys aperçebiros, 615
 Mi señora, si quereys,
 Que a vos toca que canteys,
 Y a mi que muera en hoyros.

Bea. ¿Que hazeys de cortar rama?

Alo. En dezir que cantara. 620

Bea. Pues ved lo que ganara
 En que cante vuestra fama.

Villançico.

Bea. Quien a dos amores ama,
 A trayçion le saquen ell alma.

Sin ninguna compassion, 625
 Muera muy peor que digo
 El traydor que fuere amigo
 De ley tan fuera razon.

Y pues haze tal trayçion
 Que en dos partes se derrama, 630
 A trayçion que le saquen ell alma.

Villançico.

Alo. Mal me lo demande Dios
 Si ay persona en este mundo
 A quien quiera sino a vos.

Muy bien veo, aunque estoy çiego, 635
 Que no dezis lo que creheys,
 Mas creo que lo hazeis
 Porque quedemos en juego.

Culpa es esa que la niego;
 Vos no, pues os siruen dos, 640
 Que yo no quiero sino a vos.

Lu. Lo muy bien que a parecido,
 Señora, vuestro cantar,
 Es cosa para espantar,
 Mas bien os an respondido. 645

Bea. Yo se bien que os satisfize
 Harto mas que vuestro amigo,
 Por ser verdad lo que digo,
 Y el burla de lo que dize.

Fer. Errados vays, el y vos, 650
 Que el a vos sin culpa os es.
 El erro, que siendo tres,
 No dixo sino de dos.

¡Ea, sus! señora mia,
 Cantara vuestra merce. 655

Sra. Si, señor, yo cantare
 Lo que mas callar dueria.
Oluidarte querria,
Mas bien querer me lo desuia.

Si no hago lo que deuo, 660
 Bien conozco ques ansi,
 Mas no esta la culpa en mi,
 Pues cada vez que lo prueuo,
 Te bueluo a querer de nueuo
 Mucho mas que solia, 665
Que bien querer me lo desuia.

Villançico.

Fer. No me holuideys, buen amor,
 Que no soy de holuidar, non.

Pues que sabeys que soy tal
 Para quererte a lo menos, 670

Que de muy bueno los buenos
 Dembidia me quieren mal;
 Haz presto en mi señal
 Tal que saque por razon,
 Que no soy de holbida, non. 675

Por. Cantay ya niños amores,
 Meos ollos, niño coraçon.

Ana. Espere y acabaran
 De cantar exes señores.

Mig. Tiempo es ya de abrir los ojos. 680
 Aperçeuíd vuestra amiga.

Por. Tenydes alguna cantiga?

Ana. Tengo dellas a manojos.

Villançico.

Ana. Por vida de mis ojos,
 El cauallero, 685
 Por vida de mis ojos,
 Que bien os quiero.

Quiero os de manera
 Que fuera mejor
 Sufrir mi dolor 690
 Por mas que muriera;
 Que no lo dixera,
 Mas crehe que muero,
 Por vida de los vuestros,
 Que bien os quiero. 695

Villançico.

Por. Poys dizeys que me quereys beyn,
 Porque dais fala a ningueyn?

Nan falley, dama fermosa,
A ninguén home, os suplico,
Poys sabeys que me pico
Mays dyssu que dotra cosa.
Mays el que fallaros osa
Muyta fantasia teñy,
Mays vos nan faleys a ninguén.

Entra un rey darmas de parte de otros cinco caualleros con cinco pajes con sus lanças para los cinco que no las tenían y el Rey darmas haze su personaje con el desafio de parte de los unos con la respuesta de los otros que cada uno haze y el Rey darmas les dize:

Rey.	Galanes enamorados,	705
	Tanto ques lastima veros,	
	Otros cinco caualleros	
	Membrian determinados	
	Hazeros que conoscays,	
	Por mucho bien que querays,	710
	Que dellos quien menos quiere,	
	Quiere mas, sea quien fuere,	
	Que los cinco que ay estays.	
	Si os engaña voluntad,	
	Que steys en ello dudando,	715
	Con las armas peleando,	
	Os haran dezir la verdad.	
	Pues ellos os desafian,	
	Estas lanças os embian	
	Porque no deueys tenellas	720
	Con poco reçelo dellas,	
	Por lo que de si confian.	

- Por. Eyssus san castellans ?
 Rey. No.
 Por. Ajnda que los seyan,
 Si con portuguese peleyan, 725
 Nan teyn de ollos ne mans.
 Fer. Batalla con tal querella,
 Lo que a mi me pesa della,
 Es que quantos la veran
 Se, señoras, que ternan 730
 En poco esfuerço vencella.
- Alo. Sin esperar parescer
 Dessos caualleros, digo
 Quel campo dara testigo
 De quien sabe mas querer. 735
 Rey. De manera que me puedo
 Boluer, pues con tal denuedo
 Mostrays tanto coraçon.
 Mig. Tal querella y tal razon
 Traeys para poner miedo. 740
- Por. Nan cureys dissas respostas;
 Con ellos dexayme, ausadas,
 Si nan les doy mas pançadas
 Que possan leuar a costas.
 Rey. Nunca gente tan perdida 745
 Se uio ni tan atreuida,
 Que se vienen a meter
 En cosa para perder
 La honrra y quiça la vida.

L. 742. ellos for Port. elles.

L. 743. doy for dou, mas for mais.

Huuo quien dio a entender a algunas damas questa farça tocaua maliciosament a algunas dellas y haze estas quatro coplas a los maliciosos.

Como no fuy mal diziente 750
 En mi vida ni lo soy,
 Sabed, señoras, que estoy
 Sentido de alguna gente
 Que muertos por estoruar
 Esta farça, la reprehenden, 755
 Tan bien porque no la entienden,
 O por gana de hablar.

Yo bien les gufro una cosa,
 Ahunque sea a costa mia,
 Que me la tachen de fria, 760
 Pero no de maliciosa.
 Que pues habla en general
 Sin llegarse a los cabellos,
 Los maliciosos son ellos,
 Tahures de dezir mal. 765

Comparación.

Si el ciego a juzgar se pone
 Las colores que no vehe,
 ¿No es mas ciego quien le crehe?
 A quien tocare, perdone;
 Pero los que saben mas, 770
 En su vista se confian,
 Que quando los ciegos guian,
 ¡Guay de los que van detras!

Uno de los buenos tiros
 Sera que jamas ha sido, 775
 Si quiza os he deservido,

Creyendo mucho seruiros.
Mas ahunque mejor siruiera,
Cosa es ya de mi cogida,
Por servir sembrar la vida, 780
Y coger desta manera.

Fin.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

II.—THE ENGLISH WAGNER BOOK OF 1594.

The Faust legend is the Hydra of literature. One of its heads pops up in the story of Simon Magus, its body reaches from New Testament times to the days of Goethe, while a new head has just sprouted in Stephen Philips's latest drama. The Faust story has all the ear-marks of a legend endowed with eternal youth. More than three hundred years ago the most popular tragedy on the London stage was Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*, while the play which is creating the greatest interest to-day on our American stage is a modern treatment of the Faust legend under the title of *Der Teufel*. So much for the absorbing interest which the story has (and ever will have) in its dramatic form.

For the time being, however, the present writer would like to dodge the swaying head of this literary dragon which has recently darted forth into the glare of the footlights, and direct the reader's attention to another side of this literary "Erscheinung," namely the folk literature upon the subject as we find it in the sixteenth century.

English literature in the sixteenth century contains the Faust legend in the little quarto which Marlowe used, called the English Faust Book of 1592. In spite of the fact that the text contains many passages which are not in the German Faust book of 1587, from which it was translated, the English Faust Book is of no special literary importance. The only passage of immediate interest to us is that which contains the description of Rome, and even that chapter is of value only in so far as it touches upon the question of the date of the Faust book and that of Marlowe's drama. On the other hand, the sequel to the

English Faust Book, the English Wagner Book of 1594, possesses a certain literary character which is well worth our attention. The English Wagner Book of 1594 (registered on November 16, 1593, just five months after the death of Marlowe) was written by an Oxford graduate and a man of letters. He appears to have been a gentleman who was widely read, not only in the classics but also in other fields of literature. His quotations from John Wier, his reference to the famous economist Jean Bodin, and his intimate acquaintance and imitation of Reginald Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft* mark him as a student of witchcraft and its literature, that subject which was so vitally interesting to all classes in the last decade of the sixteenth century, especially in England. Again, this writer was a traveller, to some extent, having spent considerable time in Germany. He may also have been in Austria, for he gives us a detailed description of that country and he draws very largely upon its history for the subject matter of the latter part of the English Wagner Book. London he knows by heart and is proud of her. The Thames, Westminster, St. Margaret's Church, Mile-End green, the theatres—all these objects of interest he speaks of from first hand knowledge.

If the reader should carefully peruse the works of Tho. Nashe, particularly *Pierce Penilesse* and *The Unfortunate Traveller*, and should then read through the English Wagner Book, he could not fail to be impressed by the similarity of style and expression. When the present writer first examined the contents of the latter text, he was much inclined to believe that its author was Tho. Nashe, especially when he considered the following facts. Marlowe and Nashe were not only friends but also collaborators. Thomas Orwin was the printer of the

English Faust Book in 1592, and his widow was the printer of Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage* in 1594. Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* was printed by Abel Jeffes in 1592. Abel Jeffes printed the English Wagner Book in 1594. Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller* was printed for Cuthbert Burby in 1594, and the English Wagner Book was printed for the same publisher in the same year. Of course these facts do not prove anything, but they are at least significant. In Nashe's *Strange Newes of the Intercepting certaine Letters*, printed in 1592, there occurs the phrase (quoted from Harvey) "his Margine is as deeplie learnd as *Fauste* praecor gelida." This quotation is of special interest in connection with the date of the English Faust Book and that of Marlowe's drama. In Nashe's *Lenten Stuffe* (1599) appears the use of the word "ringol or ringed circle," the earliest use of which is found in the English Wagner Book of 1594. The writings of Nashe are full of quotations from the classics: the author of the English Wagner Book also quotes from Epictetus, Plato, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Origen, Tertullian, from the *Gesta Romanorum*, and from a fifteenth century ecclesiastical work in Latin. The splendid defence of the theatre as found in *Pierce Penilesse* would have delighted the heart of the author of the English Wagner Book, for the latter was not only an admirer of the histrionic art, but he was also a very close observer of the technique of the stage. The prevailing tone of the English Wagner Book is dramatic in quality. Faust and Wagner are described as though they were right up on the stage and the author were sitting in the front row. Note the life in this description:¹ "At the conclusion of his speech *Fa.*

¹ *The English Wagner Book of 1594*, edited by A. E. Richards (*Literarhistorische Forschungen*, vol. 35, 1907), page 54.

turnd his head aside laying it betwixt his hands hiding it, so sat a great while. *Ake.* he friskt vp and down for he had neither clog nor chain, because he was in the number of the wild ones, and ouer the table and backe again. *Ak.* was the familiar which *F.* gave to *W.* who asked him in the fashion of an Ape. Such cranks, such lifts, careers and gambalds, as he plaid there, would haue made a horse laugh. *Meph.*, who as it semed was the speaker of ye Parliament in hel, rose & walked about very hastely, at length he came to the table, and striking his fist on it (the print was seene 2 yeare after, and was carried to *S. Margets* church for a relique, to shew what a hot fellow the diuell is in his anger) and again beating said, thou, and then left, and came and went, & came and went again, here he takes me one booke and hurls it against a Cupboorde, and then he takes the Cupboord and hurls it against the wall and then he takes the wall and throwes it against the house, and the house out at the Window." There is plenty of dramatic action there, surely.

The most important passage in this text in connection with the theater is the detailed description of the stage hell mouth,¹ which has already been commented ² upon by the present writer. That description alone entitles the English Wagner Book to more consideration than it has hitherto received. *A propos* of a recent article by Mr. William Archer, in the *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, vol. 44, it is interesting to note that in the English Wagner Book ³ the tiring house is evidently regarded as being an integral part of the frame of the

¹ Pages 67 ff.

² *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. XXI, 4.

³ Page 68.

theater. The passage reads: "There might you see to be short the Gibbet, the Posts, the Ladders, the tiring house, there euery thing which in the like houses either vse or necessity makes common." The reader will recollect the frequent mention of the famous actor Tarlton in the works of Tho. Nashe. In the English Wagner Book he is referred to in the following passage:¹ ". . . there at the Citty gate he drew out a long taber and a pipe and strikt vp such a merry note, as the foolish ornament of all London stages neuer could come neere him, no not when he wakte the writer of the newes out of Purgatory, with the shrill noise." (Tarlton's *Newes out of Purgatorie* was entered in the Stationer's Register on June 26, 1590, and in the same year an answer to it was printed with the title *The Cobler of Caunterie*, etc.). It is the opinion of the present writer that the description of the "right marvailous triumph" in the first chapter of the English Wagner Book was inspired by a similar passage in the English Faust Book; but both may have been influenced by Tarlton's *Seven Deadly Sinnes*.

The influence of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* is plainly seen in the direct quotation in Italian of four lines from that epic,² and also in the whole description of the magic castle to which the Wittenberg doctor goes in order to obtain the water of Oblivion.³ (It is to be remembered that a folio edition of the great Italian epic was printed in English in 1590). The sonnet which follows the lines from Ariosto's poem may be a translation from some unknown Italian or French source, or it may be entirely original. Its identity is unknown to the present writer. It has recently been shown⁴ that the influence of the

¹ Page 94.² Pages 77, 78.³ Pages 72 ff.⁴ *French Influence in English Literature*, Upham, New York, 1908.

French sonnet upon that of England in the latter half of the sixteenth century was almost as great as that of the Italian sonnet; but in view of the fact that there is no evidence elsewhere of the knowledge of French on the part of the author of our text, it is hardly probable that the source of his English poem is to be found in French literature.

Another point of literary interest is the reference in the English Wagner Book to Rabelais's *Gargantua*.¹ The passage reads as follows: ". . . his courser so firme, nimbly ioynted, tall and large, such a one as might haue beene the son of Gargantuas mare." On April 6, 1592, there was entered in the Stationer's Register *Gargantua his prophesie*, and on June 16, 1592, there is the entry *Gargantua*, and on December 4, 1594 (the year of the publication of our text), there was entered *The Historie of Gargantua*. As these publications have not survived and as nothing whatever is known about them, this reference to Rabelais's work is of special interest, for it tends to show that there was an early translation into English of Rabelais between the years 1592 and 1594. Bearing in mind what has been said in regard to the similarity in style between the author of the English Wagner Book and Tho. Nashe, it is proper to recall the fact that the two English writers who were most influenced by Rabelais were Shakespere and Tho. Nashe. So far as is known to the present writer, no one has ever attempted to elucidate the following passages in the English Wagner Book.

1. "There chaunced certaine Schollers . . . to walke abroad to a little village within foure English mile . . . of Wittenberg called *Shaftsburg*." (Page 40.)

¹ Page 99.

2. "Wherewith the Italian mocks them saying:

Germani multos possunt tolerare labores,
O vtinam possint tam bene ferre sitim.

Unto which they merrely aunswere:

Vt nos dur^a sitis, sic vos Venus improba vexat,
Lex lata est Veneri Iulia, nulla mero." (Page 40.)

3. "So long they druncke,—fetching ouer the *Green nine Muses*," etc. (Page 41.)

4. "... With whom when they haue daunced a great while (after some odde tune, as after that which they call *Robinsons delight*, but more truly a iest, though somewhat tolerable)," etc. (Page 41.)

5. "This was the bataile which was fought for the greatt Realme of Asia, by *Hercules* and *Orontides*, where Orontides was slaine, and *Hercules* sore wounded," etc. (Page 57.)

6. "... Nor is it more blasphemous to be spoake to vs men, then to God himselfe, as it is in *S. Alathero*, where the diuell was not afeard to assayle his creatour with most terrible argumentes of the diuine letter." (Page 59.)

7. "His father dwelt at Malmesburg a town hard by Wittenberg in Saxony in high Dutchland," etc. (Page 75.)

8. "A mio solemente amandona
Madonna: Donna non parelia." (Page 77.)

9. "Then he shewed them this Epigram, which he made when as before the Duke his Father, a brace of faire English Grey hounds fell down at the Harts heels starke dead, (the Hart also lying not aboue sixe yards off dead to with chasing hauing out stript the rest of the dogs aboue halfe a mile. (Page 78.)

10. "*Mephostophiles* he tearmed *Mamri*," etc. (Page 90.)

11. "... And the horse following the Elephant, as you might see *Seignior Propspero* lead the way in *Mile end Greene* in the ringles," etc. (Page 105.)

The above passages are complete enigmas to the present writer. Any light which may be thrown upon them by readers of this article would be of much value to the editor of the English text.

Finally, there are several words and phrases in the

English Wagner Book which are of some interest to lexicographers. They are the following:

1. Page 44, "slomy." This seems to be the only known instance of the word used in the sense of dark, grimy.
2. Page 48, "excircled." This word is not found in the *New English Dictionary*.
3. Page 50, "like Carthorses." The citation in the *New English Dictionary* illustrating the use of this simile is of nineteenth century date.
4. Page 54, "enough to make a horse laugh." Professor Murray informs me that this instance of the phrase is the earliest known to him.
5. Page 60, "circumstantiue." This word is illustrated in the *New English Dictionary* by a quotation from a work printed as late as 1866!
6. Page 64, "fewter." Much discussion over the meaning of this word has taken place in *Mod. Lang Notes*,¹ but the significance it possesses in the English Wagner Book has not been noted.
7. Page 68, "Epitome." The citation in the *New English Dictionary* is from a work printed thirteen years later than our text.
8. Page 81, "Hannikins." The word may be an anglicized form of *Hänschen*. On the other hand it may (in view of the context and the reference to "Hackney" in the preceding lines) be derived from the term *Hannaken*, a Czechic tribe who were noted for their handsome breed of horses. Compare the use of the word in the modern German story by Ebner-Eschenbach, *Die Freiherren von Gemperlein*, chapter 6.
9. Page 96, "lineamented." This word does not appear in any dictionary.

Taking it all in all, the English Wagner Book of 1594 seems to possess a literary character of considerable interest to lovers of folk literature.

ALFRED E. RICHARDS.

¹ See *M. L. N.*, February, 1904.

III.—*UT PICTURA POESIS.*

The Latin poem *De arte graphica* by Charles Alphonse du Fresnoy was edited with a translation into French prose and with notes by Roger de Piles in 1668; and in 1695 John Dryden, "to satisfy the desires of so many gentlemen who were willing to give the world this useful work," not only translated de Piles's book into English prose but also supplied his translation with an "original preface containing a parallel between painting and poetry." Dryden's *Parallel* is one of the least original, but it is not the least interesting of his literary essays: Saintsbury¹ calls it "the first writing at any length by a very distinguished Englishman of letters on the subject of pictorial art." Together with his translation of du Fresnoy and de Piles, it forms for us English-speaking people the handiest introduction to that long-lived esthetic theory founded upon the proposition *Ut pictura poesis*. Lessing seems to have seen in Dryden's preface some suggestion of a deviation of the parallel lines from the common direction; or perhaps the point at which they ought to have parted company; for he wrote,² "Falsche Übertragung des mahlerischen Ideals in die Poesie. Dort ist es ein Ideal der Körper, hier muss es ein Ideal der Handlungen seyn. Dryden in s. Vorrede zum Fresnoy." Lessing probably had reference to the following passage:³

¹ *History of Criticism*, Edinburgh, 1900-02, II, p. 385.

² *Laokoon*, ed. H. Blümner, Berlin, 1880, *Nachlass A*, pp. 399 f.

³ Vol. II, p. 128 of W. P. Ker's *Essays of John Dryden*, Oxford, 1900, to which text I refer throughout when quoting from the *Parallel*. I quote du Fresnoy's Latin and de Piles's notes (in Dryden's version) from *The Art of Painting by C. A. du Fresnoy, with Remarks. Translated into English, etc., by Mr. Dryden*, London, 1750.

“Next, the means of this [esthetic] pleasure is by deceit. One [of the arts] imposes on the sight, and the other on the understanding. Fiction is of the essence of poetry as well as of painting; there is a resemblance in one, of human bodies, things and actions which are not real; and in the other, of a true story by a fiction.” Lessing did de Piles the honor of saying ¹ at least, when he cited him as one of many who held an absurd opinion, “So urtheilt selbst de Piles.” Blümner was less respectful. In his introduction to *Laokoon* there is no mention of the *Parallel*, and Dryden is mentioned ² only in passing, as a poet who, like Milton and Pope, was addicted to allegory; de Piles is likewise wrecked on the rock of allegory; ³ and du Fresnoy is made to pay the penalty ⁴ for beginning his poem with the words

“Ut pictura poesis erit, similisque poesi
Sit pictura.”

All three of these men deserve from students of Lessing more consideration than they received at Blümner's hands; and the theories of art for which they stood have much more than mere historical significance. All that we concede to *Laokoon* as a polemical document of almost unexampled timeliness we must reclaim for the views that it combated when we examine the questions at issue *sub specie æternitatis*. Even in respect to poetry, the subject in which Lessing was an undoubted expert, the contention of Herder ⁵—another expert—“dass das erste Wesentliche der Poesie wirklich eine Art von Malerei, sinnliche Vor-

¹ *Laokoon*, ed. Blümner, p. 191.

² P. 18.

³ P. 37.

⁴ Pp. 35 f.

⁵ *Erstes kritisches Wäldchen*, xvi, *Werke*, ed. Suphan, vol. III, p. 138.

stellung sei" does not lack modern defenders.¹ And in respect to painting, a subject in which Lessing was no expert, the author of one of the most penetrating and suggestive modern treatments of Lessing's problems does not hesitate to espouse the cause of "the Greek Voltaire." H. Fechner writes,² "Der alte Simonides hatte doch nicht so ganz unrecht mit seiner Beobachtung, dass die Malerei eine stumme Poesie sei; ja man könnte diesen Ausspruch auf das ganze Gebiet der bildenden Kunst ausdehnen."

The only modern history of esthetics which, so far as I know, includes du Fresnoy and de Piles is K. H. von Stein's *Entstehung der neuern Ästhetik*.³ In this work, du Fresnoy seems to me to be somewhat overestimated, de Piles decidedly underestimated. An eminent French historian of art, S. Rocheblave,⁴ instructively connects du Fresnoy's poem with the early traditions of the Académie royale de Peinture et de Sculpture (founded in 1648, rehabilitated in 1662), and says that of the many attempts to formulate the doctrines of the Academicians only two of those in verse are important in his eyes: du Fresnoy's *De arte graphica* and Molière's poem, *La gloire du dôme du Val-de-grâce*, all the theories of which, and many of the verses, were derived directly from du Fresnoy. These poems, both dating from 1668, are "arts of the poetry of

¹ Cf. the chapter *Die Anschaulichkeit in der Dichtung* in Johannes Volkelt's *System der Ästhetik*, Munich, 1905, vol. I, p. 412. Friedrich Schlegel's aphorism (*Athenäum*, I (1798), p. 45) remains essentially true and very suggestive: "Die Poesie ist Musik für das innere Ohr, und Malerei für das innere Auge; aber gedämpfte Musik, aber verschwebende Malerei."

² *Lessings Laokoon und das Prinzip der bildenden Künste*, in the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, XIX (1884), p. 290.

³ Stuttgart, 1886.

⁴ *L'art français au XVII^e siècle dans ses rapports avec la littérature*, in L. Petit de Julleville's *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, Paris, 1898, vol. V, pp. 660 ff.

painting" printed six years before Boileau's *Art poétique*. Of de Piles, Rocheblave has little to say. The thesis of Paul Vitry,¹ dealing primarily with du Fresnoy, makes mention of de Piles only casually, though always discriminately. As late as 1783, Sir Joshua Reynolds² thought it worth while to supply numerous notes to a metrical translation of du Fresnoy by William Mason, and to reprint Dryden's *Parallel*; but neither Sir Joshua nor Mason spoke well of de Piles. Winckelmann³ thought more highly of de Piles, and of the other writers on art whom he had read, before going to Italy than after his settlement there. Justi⁴ describes de Piles as "bei weitem der fruchtbarste und erfolgreichste Kunstlehrer" among the Frenchmen of his time. Certain aspects of de Piles's doctrine have, however, not yet been given the attention to which they are entitled.

I.

Du Fresnoy, de Piles, and Dryden represent nearly the last stage in the development of that form of esthetic legislation which, consisting chiefly in the codification of laws on the basis of ancient authority, began early in the Renaissance, and persisted down to the middle of the eighteenth century, when respect for authority gave way to confidence in the results of the processes of logic. Du

¹ De C. A. Dufresnoy *pictoris poemate quod "De Arte graphica" inscribitur*, Paris, 1901.

² *Works*, ed. Edmond Malone, third edition, London, 1801, vol. III.

³ Cf. C. Justi, *Winckelmann*, Leipzig, 1866, I, 301. Winckelmann refers to de Piles (calling him des Piles) in the *Gedanken über die Nachahmung*, DLD 20, p. 19.

⁴ *L. c.*, p. 298.

Bos, Burke, Diderot, Menckelssohn, and Lessing¹ were all, though in different degrees, students and admirers of the classics. Lessing, the severest logician of them all, ranked² Aristotle with Euclid, and rejoiced in the confirmation which the practice of Homer gave to his theoretical deductions.³ But Lessing and his immediate predecessors were men of the age of reason. In the same way, however, that they admitted authority when it did not run counter to reason, the theorists of the Renaissance and their successors reasoned with their authorities, and by no means attached the same weight to all of the propositions which in common they held to be true. The number of these propositions—particularly those derived more or less immediately from Aristotle, and immediately from Horace—was considerable, and there is no theoretical document of the Renaissance in which we do not find the notions of imitation, representation of nature, and expression of an ideal; or the habit of treating poetry and painting as sister arts; down to the time (1561), and beyond, when Scaliger declared in so many words *Omnis enim oratio εἶδος, ἔννοια, μίμησις, quemadmodum et pictura: id quod et ab Aristotele et a Platone declaratum est.*⁴ Treatises on painting, which are less numerous only

¹ Cf. these *Publications*, xxii (1907), pp. 608 ff.

² *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, 101–4. Stück.

³ *Laokoon*, xvi, p. 252.

⁴ *Poetice*, p. 401 of the edition of 1617.—H. von Stein says (*op. cit.*, p. 125): “Scaliger verbindet die Aristotelische *μίμησις* mit dem fernerhin unzählige Male zitierten Horazischen Worte *ut pictura poesis*. Von der Malerei auf die Poesie übertragen, ergibt sich dann aus dem Begriff des Nachahmens eine Forderung. Man ahme so nach, wie der Maler nachahmt; d. h., man halte sich an bestimmte gegebene Gegenstände, man bilde die Natur ab.” This is substantially true, but is, I think, misleading. Scaliger undoubtedly gave to this combination the weight of his great authority. He was not, however, the first to make it; and, so far as

than "arts of poetry" add Pliny to the list of fruitful sources; and there is a stock of anecdotes, derived mainly from him, which successive writers infallibly draw upon in pointing their morals. Some of the more noteworthy antecedents of the *De arte graphica* demand a brief review.

The leader of the troop is Leon Battista Alberti with his treatise *Della Pittura* (1436)—a sensible little book by a very distinguished man. Alberti's aim is twofold: to aid painters in a thorough understanding of their art from the point of view of practical execution, and to inspire them with the enthusiasm that he himself feels for it as a noble means of giving immortality to mortals and perpetuating forms of beauty.¹ He cites a host of classical and pseudo-classical witnesses to the esteem in which painting has from time immemorial been held.² Imitation of nature is his fundamental rule.³ By means of drawing, composition of figures, lights, shades, and colors, the painter endeavors to represent on a suitable surface the visible aspect of things existent in space.⁴ Among these things, however, are those emotions of the soul which

I can see, he did not himself misquote Horace in the manner suggested by Stein's formula; but he did write of his hero, Virgil, *Ita enim eius poesi evenisse censeo, sicut et picturis. Nam plastae, et ii, qui coloribus utuntur, ex ipsis rebus capessunt notiones quibus lineamenta, lucem, umbram, recessus imitentur. Quod in quibusque praestantissimum inveniunt, e multis in unum opus suum transferunt ita ut non a natura didicisse, sed cum ea certasse, aut potius illi dare leges potuisse videantur. . . . Itaque non ex ipsius naturae opere uno potuimus exempla capere, quae ex una Virgiliana idea mutuati sumus* (p. 259).

¹ R. Eitelberger v. Edelberg's *Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte*, XI, Vienna, 1877, p. 89.

² L. c., p. 89.

³ *Niuno dubiti, capo et principio di questa arte, et così ogni suo grado a diventare maestro, doversi prendere dalla natura* (p. 149).

⁴ P. 69. The parts of painting recognized by Alberti are *conscriptione, compositione et ricevere di lumi* (p. 99): the first, also called *circumscriptione*, is treated on p. 101; the second, on pp. 109 ff.; and the third, on pp. 131 ff.

find expression in movements and actions of the body.¹ Human beings acting are the worthiest subjects, and historical painting is the highest type of painting.² The painter should cultivate familiarity with those who treat or have treated historical matter in other forms, namely, poets, orators, and men of letters;³ for they practise arts in many respects like his, and can furnish him with many appropriate subjects.⁴ Poets make use of allegories, which are pleasing even as conceptions, and much more so when represented on canvas;⁵ and they also inspire artists in a more general sense, as Homer inspired Phidias to his conception of the Olympian Zeus.⁶ To have life, a picture must seem to stir in every part;⁷ and the painter's object is to arouse emotion in the breast of the spectator.⁸ At the same time the painter endeavors to produce things of beauty. He always imitates nature, studying the details of the forms of nature as children study the letters and syllables of words when learning to read.⁹ He then composes his pictures in accordance with an idea of beauty,¹⁰ and by means of traits which his

¹ Pp. 121, 125.

² *Grandissima opera del pictore sarà l'istoria* (p. 105); *ma poichè la istoria è summa opera del pictore*, etc. (p. 157).

³ P. 147.

⁴ *Questi anno molti ornamenti communi col pictore, et copiosi di notitia di molte cose, molto gioveranno ad bello componere l'istoria* (p. 145).

⁵ Lucian's description of the "Calumny" of Apelles is said to be pleasing *sola senza pictura* (p. 145). *Piacerebbe ancora vedere quelle tre sorelle, a quali Hesiodo pose nome Eglie, Heufronesia et Thalia . . . per quali volea s'intendesse la liberalità, chè una di queste sorelle dà, l'altra riceve, la terza rende il beneficio, quali gradi debbano in ogni perfetta liberalità essere* (p. 147).

⁶ P. 147; cf. Strabo, VIII, 354.

⁷ P. 115.

⁸ *Pictura terrà li occhi et l'animo di chi la miri* (p. 143).

⁹ P. 149.

¹⁰ *Fuggie l'ingegni non periti quella idea delle bellezze, quale i bene exercitatisimi appena discernono* (p. 151).

observation has enabled him, like Zeuxis, to collect ¹ from many individuals. The whole is, of course, to be composed with due regard to congruency and consistency of the parts,² and the skilful hand of the painter will always make it seem to have been reproduced from nature.³ With the many and useful technical matters which Alberti discusses we have no immediate concern. In conclusion we may note that he esteems painting more highly than sculpture;⁴ and that, though he recommends the copying of statues as more instructive training for a painter than the copying of paintings,⁵ he does not laud Greek statues as in any sense norms of beauty; indeed, he does not refer to them at all.

Lionardo da Vinci's *Libro di Pittura* ⁶ treats painting as a science that he has studied experimentally; and reference to authorities, or even to other examples than those furnished by nature, are rare in it. The second and third of its three parts deal with very technical matters; the first is mostly taken up with a general definition of painting. In this part we find what is probably the earliest "parallel" between painting and poetry, as it is certainly the most remarkable. Poetry, to be sure, fares ill in this comparison, but for causes like those which made Lessing

¹ P. 151.

² Pp. 111, 115.

³ *Ma chi da essa natura s'auzerà prendere qualunque facci cosa, costui renderà sua mano sì esercitata, che sempre qualunque cosa farà, parrà tratta dal naturale* (p. 153).

⁴ *Sono certo queste arti cognate et da uno medesimo ingegno nutrite la pictura insieme con la scoltura. Ma io sempre preposi l'ingegno del pictore, perchè s'aoopera in cosa più difficile* (p. 95).

⁵ P. 155.

⁶ First published in Paris in 1651, without the first part, in which alone we are interested; now accessible in the edition, with a translation into German and a commentary, by Heinrich Ludwig: Nos. XV, XVI, XVII of Eitelberger's *Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte*, Vienna, 1882.

on his part unfair to painting; and, as Lionardo's editor says,¹ "Einem jeden wird sich bei diesem Faszikel des ersten Teils der Gedanke an Lessings Laokoon nahe legen. Wer aber aus der letzteren Schrift Konsequenzen für die Malerei und deren Verfahren ableiten wollte—was ja doch Lessings eigene Absicht nicht war, da dieser nur die Reformation des zeitgenössischen Geschmacks in der Poesie im Auge hatte—der müsste offenbar Lionardos Gedanken hiebei zum Korrektiv nehmen." Lessing makes his own definition of painting; and Lionardo, proceeding like Lessing from "imitation" as a starting-point,² recognizes in poetry a suitable art for the reproduction of such insignificant things as the words³ of men, but cannot too strongly emphasize its inadequacy to reproduce anything else. The kind of poetry that he condemns is in all cases descriptive.

As a true painter and a sturdy realist, Lionardo knows no other standard of value than the potential effect of real objects upon the senses; and no sense that can be compared with the sense of sight. The eye is the highest⁴ and the most reliable⁵ of the organs of sense; it is the window of the soul,⁶ through which alone can come to man an accurate conception of creation and his place therein.⁷ The painter presents to the eye images exactly similar in appearance to natural objects;⁸ painting is the sole art that imitates all visible things;⁹ it is universally and immediately intelligible without an inter-

¹ Vol. III, p. 153.

² Vol. I, pp. 36, 44.

³ *Solo il uero uffitio del poeta è fingere parole di gente, che insieme parlino* (vol. I, p. 24):

⁴ P. 18.

⁵ P. 16.

⁶ Pp. 30, 44.

⁷ P. 46.

⁸ P. 20.

⁹ *La pittura, la quale è sola imitatrice di tutte l'opere evidenti di natura* (p. 16).

preter,¹ and arouses the passions of men and animals as if its images were realities.² But the painter is not a mere copier of reality: the hands execute what the fancy conceives; ³ there is no limit to the range of the painter's inventions,⁴ and his depicted figures have symbolical as well as objective significance.⁵ To his representations of the gods, people have made pilgrimages as to the divine presence itself.⁶ In many of these things, poets have vied with painters, but with inferior means; as the hearing is inferior to sight,⁷ as letters and words are inferior to things,⁸ as the name is inferior to the similitude of the object,⁹ as the imagination is inferior to the eye.¹⁰ The poet is as free as the painter to conceive ideals,¹¹ or to invent stories;¹² he can produce illusion,¹³ and rouse the emotions.¹⁴ But he cannot give to his ideal an objective reality.¹⁵ The painter can make his story more easily intelligible and less tiresome;¹⁶ the poet's illusion has none of the vividness of the painter's;¹⁷ and if the poet moves his auditors, he is perhaps then to be called rather an orator than a poet.¹⁸ The poet can prove by argumentation; the painter convinces by an exhibit.¹⁹ The poet tediously enumerates the parts of a body,²⁰ or re-

¹ Pp. 8, 38, 40.² Pp. 20, 32, 50.³ P. 32.⁴ Pp. 24, 48.

⁵ *E potrà dire un poeta: io farò una finzione che significherà cose grande; questo medesimo farà il pittore, come fece Apelle la calunnia (p. 32). Dice il poeta, che descrive una cosa, che ne rappresenta un'altra piena di belle sentenze; il pittore dice aver in arbitrio di far il medesimo, e in questa parte anco egli è poeta (p. 48).*

⁶ P. 12.⁷ Pp. 18, 52, 54.⁸ Pp. 32, 52, 100.⁹ P. 30.¹⁰ P. 22.¹¹ P. 28.¹² P. 30.¹³ P. 44.¹⁴ P. 48.¹⁵ P. 28.

¹⁶ *E se tu, poeta, figurerai un' istoria co' la pittura della penna, il pittore col penello la farà di più facile satisfatione e meno tediosa a esser compresa (p. 30).*

¹⁷ Pp. 42, 48.¹⁸ P. 50.¹⁹ P. 32.²⁰ Pp. 20, 38, 42, 48.

counts the successive stages of an action; ¹ the painter's representation of bodies and actions concentrates all their elements into a single moment.² If, therefore, the effect of a poem be likened to that of a melody sung by a single voice, the effect of a picture is the wonderful harmony of simultaneous coöperation.³ Poetry is an art or science dependent upon many other sciences for aid; painting is a science that contributes its aid to others.⁴ Poetry beguiles the mind with mendacious inventions; painting represents the works of God as they are.⁵ Poetry gives us the shadows of things; painting, the bodies that cast the shadows.⁶ If you call painting dumb poetry, the painter may say that poetry is blind painting. Who are more afflicted, the blind or the dumb? ⁷ Poetry may indeed be called a science for the blind, and painting, a science for the dumb. But even then, painting occupies the higher rank, since it appeals to the higher sense.⁸ Painting is poetry that is seen and not heard: poetry is painting that is heard and not seen. These two "poetries," then, or, if you please, "paintings," have exchanged the senses through which they must enter our understand-

¹ Suppose that you, a painter, wish to represent a battle. *In questo caso il pittore ti supera, perchè la tua penna fia consumata, innanzi che tu descriua appieno quel, che immediato il pittore ti rappresenta co' la sua scientia. E la tua lingua sarà impedita dalla sete, et il corpo dal sonno e fame, prima che tu co' parole dimostri quello, che in un istante il pittore ti dimostra. Nella qual pittura non manca altro, che l'anima delle cose finite, et in ciascun corpo è l'integrità di quella parte, che per un sol aspetto può dimostrarsi, il che lunga e tediosissima cosa sarebbe alla poesia a ridire tutti li mouimenti de li operatori di tal guerra, e le parti delle membra, e lor' ornamenti, delle quali cose la pittura finita con gran breuità e uerità ti pone innanzi (p. 22).*

² Pp. 54, 64.

³ P. 38.

⁴ Pp. 20, 46, 48, 68 ff.

⁵ P. 54.

⁶ *Tal proportione è dall' imaginatione all' effetto, qual' è dall' ombra al corpo ombroso, e la medesima proportione è dalla poesia alla pittura (p. 4).*

⁷ P. 30.

⁸ P. 24.

ing.¹ But it is a crime against nature to bring in by the ear what belongs to the eye.²

Ten years after the death of Lionardo, Giovanni Giorgio Trissino begins the first division of his *Poetica* (Vicenza, 1529) with this brief "parallel" of painting and poetry: *Dico adunque che la poesia (come prima disse Aristotele) è una imitazione de le azioni de l'homo; e facendosi questa cotale imitazione con parole, rime, et harmonica, si come la imitazione del dipintore si fa con disegno e con colori.*³ And again, speaking of beauty, he says, *La bellezza adunque, e la culteza, le quali massimamente si apartengono al poeta, perciò che senza esse i versi suoi non sarebbono suavi, e dolci, in dui modi si considera: l'uno de li quali è naturale, e l'altro adventizio; cioè, che sì come nei corpi alcuni sono belli per la naturale corrispondenza e convenienza de le membra, e dei colori, et altri per la cura, che vi si fa, e per qualche ornamento, che vi si pone, divengono belli; così è nei poemi, che alcuni di essi sono belli per la corrispondenza e convenienza de le membra, e dei colori, che hanno, et altri per qualche ornamento extrinseco, che vi s'aggiunge s'abbelliscono; e sì come quel primo non è altro, che trattare ciascuna sentenza con la debita elezione di parole, e con le figure e rime opportune, e mescolare convenientemente tutte le forme di dire: Così questo ornativo è una certa cosa, che si da a li poemi, la quale fa coloro, che li sentono recitare, commuoversi, et amirarli; e questo consiste solamente ne le parole, e ne le rime, figure, e clausule, etc.*⁴

Trissino's contemporary, Bernardino Daniello (*La Poetica*, Venice, 1536,) is more occupied with the substance and the philosophical content than with the form of

¹ P. 34.² P. 44.³ P. ii.⁴ P. vii.

poetry; but he is not impatient of even minute details of form; and besides the usual superficial "parallel" between poetry and painting, he has some noteworthy observations on both arts. The "parallel" resembles Trissino's, indeed is singularly like that drawn in the next century by Opitz:¹ *Per tanto dico, non senza grandissima ragione, essere stata essa poetica da gli antichi et sapientissimi huomini alla pittura assomigliata; et detto essa pittura altro non esser che un tacito et muto poema: Et allo 'ncontro pittura parlante la poesia. Perciochè come l'imitatione del dipintore si fa con stili, con pennelli, et con diuersità di colori (co' quali esso poi la natura, gli atti, et la sembianza o d'huomo, o d'altro animale imitando; ci rende la imagine di quello al uiuo somigliante) così quella del poeta si fa con la lingua, et con la penna, con numeri, et harmonie.*² Following Aristotle,³ and Cicero⁴ (as Vida⁵ did), Daniello recognizes three parts in poetry:⁶ *l'inventione . . . o uogliamo dire ritrouamento; la dispositione poi, ouer ordine di esse [cose]; et finalmente la forma dello scriuere ornatamente le già ritrouate et disposte, che (latinamente parlando) elocutione si chiama; et che noi uolgare, leggiadro et ornato parlare chiameremo.* As to the first of the three parts, the poet is unlimited, the opinion of some people to the contrary notwithstanding. *Anzi essergli conceduto ampia licenza (si come anchora è al dipintore, di finger molte et diuerse cose, diuersamente) di potere di tutte quelle cose che in*

¹ Cf. these *Publications*, vol. XXIII (1908), p. 524.

² Pp. 24 f.

³ *Rhetoric*, III, I § πλοτεῖς, τάξις, λέξις.

⁴ *Orator ad M. Brutum*, III: *Quoniam tria videnda sunt oratori, quid dicat, et quo quidque loco, et quomodo.*

⁵ *Poeticorum libri tres* (1527). Cf. Charles Rattaux's *Quatre Poétiques*, Paris, 1771, vol. II, p. 70.

⁶ P. 26 f.

grado li fiano ragionare, et iscriuere. Ben è uero che egli dee sempre hauer risguardo di sciegliere di tutte il più bello, et uago fiore . . . il sapere è principio et fonte dello iscriuer bene et dirittamente le cose: et la philosophia sola è quella che ne può amministrar gli alti concetti et le belle inuentioni. Following Aristotle¹ again, Daniello² admonishes the poet not to be bound, as the historian is, to the facts of former happenings, but, however much poetry and history may be alike in form, to mingle fact and fiction; for it is not writing in verse that makes the poet, but the presentation of things as they ought to be, in contradistinction to the historian's method of presenting them as they were: *er will bloss zeigen, wie es eigentlich gewesen*, to quote Ranke.³ There are in truth resemblances enough: ⁴ *Ambo studiano in muouer gli affetti, il decoro di ciascuna cosa in ciascuna cosa et materia seruando. Ambo insegnano, dilettono, et giouano parimente. Ambo le cose ne dipingono; et quasi dauanti a gli occhi le ci pongono.*

As Saintsbury says,⁵ there are some rather striking things in Daniello. But there is no serviceable distinction between painting and poetry. Such a distinction was soon made, however, by Benedetto Varchi. An inquiry, *In che siano simili et in che differenti i poeti et i pittori*,⁶ formed the conclusion of a lecture that Varchi delivered before the Florentine Academy in 1546. The lecturer

¹ *Poetica*, IX; cf. J. E. Spingarn, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*,² New York, 1908, pp. 28 f.

² Pp. 41 f.

³ *Vorrede zu den "Geschichten der romanischen und germanischen Völker,"* 1824.

⁴ P. 42.

⁵ *L. c.*, II, p. 43.

⁶ *Lezioni*, Florence, 1590, pp. 226-230. My attention was called to this "parallel" by Spingarn, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

begins with the observation that the two arts have one and the same end, which is to imitate nature, and that Dante, Petrarch, and Horace (A. P., 9 f., 361 f.) used the terms of each to describe the processes of the other. *Ut pictura poesis* looms up ominously here; but it is worth noting that Varchi cites the whole sentence in which this phrase occurs. He proceeds at once to differentiate. As if in tacit refutation of Daniello, he maintains that poetry is not philosophy, though in parts it may treat philosophical questions, as Dante did; nor is it merely verse, as distinguished from prose: *onde chi traduce Aristotile in uersi non sarebbe poeta, ma filosofo, come chi riduce Vergilio in prosa, non sarebbe oratore, ma poeta*. But there is a poetic style, which consists, besides numbers, in poetic words, figures, and modes of speech, *e così hauemo ueduto, perchè la poesia si chiama arte, e che è simile alla pittura, perchè amendue imitano la natura. Ma è da notare: che il poeta l'imita colle parole, et i pittori co i colori, e quello, che è più, i poeti imitano il di dentro principalmente, cioè i concetti, e le passioni dell' animo, se bene molte uolte discriuono ancora, e quasi dipingono colle parole i corpi, e tutte le fattezze di tutte le cose così animate, come inanimate; et i pittori imitano principalmente il difuori, cioè i corpi, e le fattezze di tutte le cose. E perchè i concetti, e l'azzioni de' re sono diuerse da quelle de i priuati, e quelle de' priuati sono differenti fra loro, secondo le diuerse nature, e professioni, perchè altre parole, e altri costumi ha ordinariamente e si ricercano in uno soldato, che in un mercatante, anzi un medesimo è differente da sè stesso o per le diuerse età, o per gli uari accidenti le quali tutte cose s'hanno a sapere e sprimere da' poeti: per questa cagione si ritrouano diuerse spezie di poesia, il che non auuiene nella pittura,*

perchè tutti i corpi sono ad un modo così quegli de' principi, come de' priuati, il che de gl'animi non auuiene essendo tutti differenti, cioè hauendo diuersi concetti: onde se bene i poeti, et i pittori imitano, non però imitano ne le medesime cose, ne' medesimi modi; imitano quegli colle parole, e questi co' colori, il perchè pare, che sia tanta differenza fra la poesia, e la pittura, quanta è fra l'anima e'l corpo, bene è vero, che come i poeti descriuono anchora il di fuori, così i pittori mostrano quanto più possono il di dentro, cioè gl'affetti, et il primo, che ciò anticamente facesse questo, secondo che racconta Plinio, fu Aristide Thebano, e modernamente Giotto. Bene è vero, che i pittori non possono sprimere così felicemente il didentro, come il difuori.

This is sound doctrine: wherein is Lessing's own any sounder? Have we not here even the determination of actions (expressions of the soul) as the principal subject of poetry, and of bodies as the particular subject of painting? In still another matter Varchi stands on the same ground as Lessing: *i dipintori se bene nel ritrarre dal naturale, debbono imitare la natura, e sprimere il vero quanto più sanno, possono non dimeno, anzi debbono, come ancora i poeti usare alcuna discrezione*; i. e., in the interest of beauty, like Apelles when, by painting a profile, he concealed the blind eye of Antigonus; like the sculptors who put a helmet on the head of Pericles; like Timanthes in his picture of the sacrifice of Iphigenia; like Alcamenes, who contrived to give grace even to the lameness of Vulcan.¹ Varchi says, as Lessing does, that it was well for Zeuxis and Apelles to draw inspiration from Homer; but Varchi opines that Dante inspired

¹ These ancient examples are all referred to also by Alberti; *l. c.*, pp. 115, 119, 123.

Michelangelo in a different manner: *io per me non dubito punto, che Michelagnolo, come ha imitato Dante nella poesia, così non l'abbia imitato nell' opere sue, non solo dando loro quella grandezza, e maestà, che si vede ne' concetti di Dante, ma ingegnandosi ancora di fare quello, o nel marmo, o con i colori, che haueua fatto egli nelle sentenze, e colle parole, e chi dubita, che nel dipignere il giudizio nella Capella di Roma, non gli fusse l'opera di Dante, la quale egli ha tutta nella memoria, sempre dinanzi a gl'occhi?* For Dante was non meno pittore che poeta.

What Varchi said of Dante was similarly said, and illustrated, of Ariosto by Lodovico Dolce in one of the most important books on painting produced during the sixteenth century, the *Dialogo della Pittura, intitolato l'Aretino* (Venice, 1557).¹ If painters, says Dolce,² wish without trouble to find a perfect model of a beautiful woman, all they have to do is to read the stanzas in which Ariosto so wonderfully describes the charms of the fairy Alcina; in doing which they will observe that good poets are also good painters. Dolce is the spiritual ancestor of both du Fresnoy and de Piles. It is true that neither of them refers to him by name—du Fresnoy cites no authorities whatever—but the enthusiasm for Titian which both shared with him would create a strong presumption of acquaintance, even though there were no evidences of influence. These, however, are not lacking; and in spite of the fact that Dolce's dialogue has been passed in re-

¹ Translated into German by Cajetan Cerri in *Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte* edited by R. Eitelberger v. Edelberg, II, Vienna, 1871. I quote from an edition with a translation into French published in Florence in 1735. My copy belongs to the Boston Public Library.

² P. 178; cf. *Laokoon*, xx, pp. 285-290.

view by Blümner,¹ we cannot omit mention of its salient features.

Aretino, as the mouthpiece of Dolce, proclaims painting to be nothing but an imitation of nature (the closer the better), an imitation, that is to say, of visible things by means of lines and colors; whereas poetry, also an imitation, imitates not only these things but everything that is revealed to the mind.² The painter is a dumb poet, and the poet, a painter who speaks. But the painter can make his dumb figures seem to speak, to weep, and laugh; and can represent thoughts and emotions in so far forth as these are manifested in actions or attitudes, especially as they are seen in the eyes, the windows of the soul.³ This result is, of course, attained by the appeal of pictures to the imagination of the spectator; and such appeals, the painter's task being *di rappresentar con l'arte sua qualunque cosa, talmente simile alle diverse opere della natura, ch'ella paja vera*,⁴ not only produce a perfect illusion (like Zeuxis's grapes and Parrhasius's curtain),⁵ but also arouse emotion: *altrimenti reputi il pittore di non haver fatto nulla; perchè questo è il condimento di tutte le sue virtù . . . Ne può muovere il pittore, se prima nel far delle figure non sente nel suo animo quelle passioni, o diciamo affetti, che vuole imprimere in quello d'altrui. Onde dice il tante volte allegato Horatio [A. P., 102], se vuoi, ch'io pianga, è mestiero, che tu avanti ti dolga teco*.⁶ The painter, then, expresses *himself* by means of the lines and colors of his picture. But he also depicts actions, facts, and fictions in the person of the actors; painting is both poetry and history;⁷ *l'historia*,

¹ *Laokoon*, pp. 15-17.

² P. 106.

³ P. 110; cf. Lionardo, *supra*, p. 48.

⁴ P. 110.

⁵ P. 214.

⁶ P. 226.

⁷ P. 116.

*in che Rafaello imitò talmente gli scrittori, che spesso il giudizio de gl'intendenti si muove a credere, che questo pittore habbia le cose meglio dipinte, che essi discritte; o almeno, che seco giostri di pari.*¹ Michelangelo is compared with Raphael as a painter of historical subjects: *Non so, quanto al componimento della historia, che Michel' Agnolo ceda a Rafaello; anzi tengo il contrario; cioè, che Michel' Agnolo nel vinca d'assai. Perciochè odo dire, che nell' ordine del suo stupendo Giudicio si contengono alcuni sensi allegorici profondissimi, i quali vengono intesi da pochi. In questo meriterebbe lode, essendo che parrebbe, ch' egli havesse imitato quei gran filosofi, che nascondevano sotto velo di poesia misteri grandissimi della filosofia humana e divina, affine ch' e' non fossero intesi dal volgo: quasi che non volessero gettare a porci le margherite.*² This admission is intended, however, as an encomium upon profundity, not upon unintelligibility; for Aretino proceeds: *Non mi par molta lode, che . . . solo i dotti intendano la profondità delle allegorie che nascondono.*³ As a maker and creator, the painter stands in close relation to the poet: he is advised not only to read history and poetry with diligence, but also to cultivate the society of poets: ⁴ *et è cosa iscambievole, che i pittori cavino spesso le loro inventioni da i poeti, et i poeti da i pittori;* ⁵ e. g., Virgil described Laocoön as he saw him in the marble group of the Rhodian sculptors. The whole art of painting is comprised in invention, design, and coloring.⁶ *La inventione è la favola, o historia*, that is, the poetic element, which nevertheless gives rise to quasi technical

¹ P. 232.² P. 242. Cf. K. Borinski, *Die Rätsel Michelangelos*, Munich, 1908.³ P. 244.⁴ P. 172.⁵ P. 250.⁶ *Inventione, disegno, colorito*; p. 150.

problems of grouping, characterization, congruence, contrast, and the like. Design and coloring are purely technical—though we often enough find design applied to the problems of poetic composition—and in these elements, the problem of the artist's relation to nature presses for solution; *perciòchè la inventione si appresenta per la forma; e la forma non è altro, che disegno. Deve adunque il pittore procacciar non solo d'imitar, ma di superar la natura. Dico superar la natura in una parte: che nel resto è miracoloso, non pur se vi arriva, ma quando vi si avvicina. Questo è in dimostrare col mezo dell' arte in un corpo solo tutta quella perfettion di bellezza, che la natura non suol dimostrare a pena in mille. Perchè non si trova un corpo humano così perfettamente bello, che non gli manchi alcuna parte. Onde habbiamo lo esempio di Zeusi; che havendo a dipingere Helena,¹ etc.—the familiar anecdote. E parte si debbono imitar le belle figure di marmo, o di bronzo de' maestri antichi. La mirabile perfettion delle quali chi gusterà e possederà a pieno, potrà sicuramente corregger molti difetti di essa natura, e far le sue pitture riguardevoli e grate a ciascuno: perciòchè le cose antiche contengono tutta la perfettion dell' arte, e possono essere esemplari di tutto il bello.²*

II.

De Piles comes nearest to giving a bibliography of his subject on page 114 (of Dryden's translation). After mentioning Pliny and Franciscus Junius on painting, he continues, "Many moderns have written of it with small success, taking a large compass without coming di-

¹ P. 176.

² P. 190.

rectly to the point, and talking much without saying anything; yet some of them have acquitted themselves successfully enough. Amongst others, Leonardo da Vinci (though without method); Paulo Lomazzo, whose book is good for the greatest part, but whose discourse is too diffuse and very tiresome; John Baptist Armenini, Franciscus Junius, and M. de Chambray, to whose preface I rather invite you than to his book. We are not to forget what M. Félibien has written of the historical piece of Alexander by the hand of M. Le Brun. Besides that the work itself is very eloquent, the foundations which he establishes for the making of a good picture are wonderfully solid."

Lionardo is treated above. Franciscus Junius scarcely falls within the scope of the present inquiry; for his book *De pictura veterum* (1637), though it was known to du Fresnoy, and was the source of most of the classical examples adduced by de Piles, is hardly more than an encyclopedia of examples, and does not give evidence that the immensely erudite compiler had a single idea of his own on the theory of the arts. Vitry affirms¹ that du Fresnoy derived from Junius the three sub-divisions of the art of painting (*inventio, graphis, chromatice*—adopted by Molière under the names of *l'invention, le dessin, le coloris*) upon which he constructed his system. This does not seem very probable. Junius's classification² makes five heads, as follows: (1) *inventio sive historia*, (2) *proportio sive symmetria*, (3) *color, et in eo lux et umbra, candor et tenebrae*, (4) *motus, et in eo actio et passio*, (5) *collocatio denique sive oeconomica totius operis dispositio*. Dolce, on the contrary, divides,³ as

¹ P. 35.² *Argumentum libri tertii.*³ P. 150.

was said above,¹ into the three parts that reappear in du Fresnoy. Quoting Plutarch, Junius says in the fourth chapter² of his first book, *Quamobrem etiam non ineleganter Simonides dixit picturam esse poesin tacentem: poesin vero picturam loquentem*. This chapter consists of a six-headed phalanx of Greek and Latin witnesses to the alleged identity of painting and poetry. As Blümner remarks,³ "was sie belegen wollen, ist ganz äusserlich."

Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo's *Trattato dell'arte della pittura, scultura, ed architettura* (Milan, 1585) is well characterized by de Piles. Its seven books fill nearly fifteen hundred octavo pages in a modern reprint.⁴ The work is technical to the last detail, and traditional with indefatigable amplitude.⁵ A single sentence from the first volume⁶ may illustrate Lomazzo's position with reference to the fundamental problem of painting and sculpture. Both arts, he says, tend to the same end, which is *di rappresentare agli occhi nostri le sostanze individue; e tutte due parimenti lo fanno, seguitando la quantità geometrica d'essi individui; e così l'una come l'altra egualmente s'affatica di rappresentare la bellezza, il decoro, il moto, ed i contorni delle cose; e finalmente tutte due non sono intente ad altro, che ritrarre le cose al naturale più simili che possono*. In the second volume, chapter LII of the sixth book has ten pages of "hieroglyphs," i. e.,

¹ P. 58.² § 2.³ P. 35.⁴ Rome, 1844.

⁵ Another of Lomazzo's books, entitled *Idea del tempio della pittura*, Milan, 1590, mentions (p. 18) among other authorities on drawing and painting, Varchi's and Dolce's treatises considered above. The first chapter in de Piles's *Cours de peinture par principes* (Paris, 1708), to be discussed later, expounds *l'idée de la peinture*, and has (pp. 21-24) a description of a *palais de la peinture* which was perhaps suggested by Lomazzo's "temple."

⁶ P. 11.

ancient and authentic figures, attitudes, and attributes for the expression of more or less abstract qualities and the personification thereof. Thus, *un uomo con la falce nella destra, e l'arco nella sinistra, significa che alcuna volta si affatica, ed alcun' altra con travaglio si esercita nelle cose della guerra;*¹ *uno coll' elmo in testa con dentro una penna di struzzo a cavallo d'un toro, e che conduce con la sinistra un cavallo, è simbolo di malizia;*² *una donna bella assisa sopra uno sgabello, significa allegrezza;*³ *un uomo assiso in terra è rustico.*⁴ With an abundance of such symbols as these at hand, there would seem to be nothing that the painter cannot express; and though the present age is degenerate, the ancients and the artists of the time of Michelangelo gave expression to ideas which they formed in their minds;⁵ and their inventions were like those of the poets. Chapter LXVI (*Di varj affetti umani*) elaborates the likeness between poet and painter even to the extent of quoting fifty pages of "poetic pictures" found in poets from Homer to Ariosto. This chapter begins,⁶ *Considerando la cagione onde sia nato quel detto antico, tanta esser la conformità della poesia con la pittura, che quasi nate ad un parto, l'una pittura loquace, e l'altra poesia mutola si appellarono; e perciò che di rado è che ingegno atto ed inclinato a qual si è l'una di esse, non si stenda e non si compiaccia in gran maniera dell' altra parimenti.* The citations are intended to prove that *la poesia è come ombra della pittura, e l'ombra non può stare senza il suo corpo.*⁷

¹ P. 384.² P. 385.³ P. 391.⁴ P. 392.⁵ P. 460. Lomazzo's "idea" is hardly more than a well considered plan.⁶ P. 468.⁷ P. 469; cf. Lionardo, *supra*, p. 50. Du Fresnoy does not seem to have made much use of Lomazzo. De Piles, however, added as a note to

Giòvanni Battista Armenini's treatise *De' veri precetti della pittura* (Ravenna, 1587) is of small account. Like Lomazzo, Armenini owes much to Lionardo, manuscripts of whose works were widely circulated in Italy. In a brief "parallel"¹ we read, after having been told that both poetry and painting are arts of imitation, *Conciosia cosa che pure per essi famosi ci sia dimostrato con molte belle et viue ragioni, il proprio ufficio di un pittore douer esser quello, che etiamdio d'un poeta esser si vede; si che per ciò a chi dubitar di ciò volesse, non li rimarrebbe luoco. Et per certo che se si riguarda in queste due arti bene, et con sano giudicio, vi si vede così smisurata unione et congiuntione insieme d'affinità, che per ciò si chiama la pittura, poetica che tace, et la poetica, pittura che parla, et questa l'anima² douer essere, et quella il corpo; dissimile però in questo si tengono, perchè l'una imita con i colori, l'altra con le parole. Ma certamente che in quanto all' inuentione predetta, et in quanto alla verità, sono d'una stessa proprietà, et d'uno effetto medesimo: conciosia cosa che elle parimente si mirano insieme, et sono intente al pascere gli animi de' mortali, et con sommo piacere et diletto consolarli, et incitar i loro spiriti, et i loro nobili animi alle cose dignissime, et virtuose, spesso ancora egli si cambia da gli huomini similmente le proprietà delle voci, che sono*

Du Fresnoy's line 114 "the measures of a human body" given in Lomazzo's first book, *Della proporzione naturale ed artificiale delle cose*. This first book was translated into French and printed (Toulouse, 1649) under the title *Traité de la proportion naturelle et artificielle des choses* by Hilaire Pader, the author of two poems, *La peinture parlante* (1653), and *Le songe énigmatique de la peinture universelle* (1658), neither of which is accessible to me. Cf. Vitry, p. 33. The Harvard University Library has a copy of Pader's *Traité*, and also a copy of Richard Haydocke's translation of Lomazzo's first five books under the title *A Tracte containing the Artes of curious Paintinge, Caruinge and Buildinge*, Oxford, 1598.

¹ P. 25.

² Cf. Varchi, *supra*, p. 55.

fra il pittore et il poeta, perciocchè l'uno usa quello ch' è dell' altro, conciosia cosa che si dica il pittor descriuere, et il poeta dipingere. Et i Grechi etiamdio per dimostrar più chiaro così fatta unione, usarono un cotal verbo, grapho, comune a questi et a quelli.

Before we proceed to Chambray and Félibien, a word about Giovanni Pietro Bellori's *Idea del pittore*,¹ which was first expounded in a lecture delivered before the Roman Academy di San Luca in 1664. Dryden,² though he cannot much commend the style, must needs say there is somewhat in the matter. There is indeed. Bellori is no more original than any of these writers; but he is a little clearer and fuller in treating the nature and function of the artistic imagination; and his "idea" quite rationally develops from a Neoplatonic mysticism to the matter-of-factness of that confession³ of Raphael's which has been so often alluded to, and in which Wackenroder⁴ saw evidence of divine inspiration. There are difficulties in the way of a theorist who wishes to reconcile imitation of nature with expression of an ideal; or who prescribes that the forms of art shall be forms of nature, but that the imperfections of natural creatures shall nevertheless be corrected in art. For what shall be the norm to which the products of art must conform? And whence shall the artist derive the guiding principles by which to make his corrections? Practically, the statues of the ancients

¹ Preface to *Le Vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti moderni*, Rome, 1672.

² Ker, II, p. 123.

³ *Per dipingere una bella mi bisognerebbe vedere più belle, ma per essere contenta di belle donne, io mi seruo di una certa idea, che mi viene in mente.* Letter to Castiglione. Quoted, e. g., by Winckelmann, *Gedanken*, DLD 20, p. 14.

⁴ *Herzensergiessungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders*, ed. K. D. Jessen, Leipzig, 1904, pp. 7, 10 f.

may be set up as models; but the question still remains, what are the qualities that give them the right to be thus exalted? This question was more or less prominent in the minds of the Renaissance writers on painting and poetry according as they were primarily philosophers or primarily artists; but the more the poetic character of the painter is emphasized, the more he must become a maker and creator even of those quasi-natural forms by means of which he tells his story. As we have seen, Dolce is the first of the writers here considered who recommends the ancient marbles and bronzes as models to be followed by the painter that undertakes the delicate task of correcting and improving upon nature. But for Dolce, as for Alberti, a beautiful form is practically a composite made by collecting the scattered beauties of nature in a single new creation. Trissino's notion of beauty is a combination of symmetry with extrinsic ornaments. Varchi commends the discreet avoidance of naturalism. Lionardo subscribes to the Neoplatonic doctrine that the things of nature are veritable images of the ideas of God;¹ but his practical precept for the production of beautiful forms is selection and combination of beautiful details.² The first systematic presentation of the sanction of artistic ideals—like Raphael's—seems to be that given by Giorgio Vasari in the *Introduzione* to his *Vite* (1550, 1568). Describing architecture, sculpture, and painting as daughters of design,³ Vasari sets forth that design⁴ is *una appa-*

¹ P. 20.

² P. 182. Bellori attributes this precept to both Alberti and Lionardo; cf. p. 6; Dryden, p. 120.

³ *Vite*, Florence, 1846, vol. I, p. 149. Painting and sculpture are said (p. 91) to be twin sisters. It remained for Lomazzo to make poetry and painting *quasi nate ad un parto* (vol. II, p. 468), *supra*, p. 62.

⁴ P. 149.

rente espressione e dichiarazione del concetto che si ha nell'animo, and that this *concetto* is something that somebody has *nella mente immaginato e fabbricato nell'idea*. Design, then, emanates from the intellect; and the intellect, on the basis of knowledge, constructs for itself the notion of an archetype from which all existent objects are variations, with individual proportions and peculiarities. Vasari calls this notion *giudizio universale*. The *concetto* is such a generalized judgment; and since design expresses thus the universal in the particular, the intelligent observer—*ex ungue leonem*—recognizes in the fiction of the mind a true representation of the facts of nature.

Armenini, who believes, with Alberti, that history is the supreme subject for a painter, must needs define what the painter shall represent. And so he says,¹ *Deue prima il pittore hauer nella mente una bellissima idea, per le cose, ch' egli oprar vuole, accioch' egli non faccia cosa, che sia senza consideratione et pensamiento; ma che cosa sia idea, diremo breuemente fra i pittori non deuer esser altro, che la forma apparente delle cose create, concette nell' animo del pittore, onde l'idea dell' huomo è esso huomo uniuersale, al cui sembiante sono fatti poi gli huomini. Altri dissero poi l'idea essere le similitudini delle cose fatte da Dio, perciocchè prima ch' egli creasse, scolpì nella mente le cose, ch' egli crear voleua, et le dipinse. Così l'idea del pittore si può dire esser quella imagine, che prima egli si forma, et scolpisce nella mente di quella cosa, che o disegnare, o dipigner voglia, la qual subito dato il soggetto li vien nascendo.*

Bellori, having defined the ideas of the great Artificer, and shown how the "inequality of material" prevents

¹ P. 137.

nature from realizing her intentions —though these are always good—proceeds with a passage¹ which Dryden² has blunted by too much condensation: *Questa idea, ouero dea della pittura e della scoltura, aperte le sacre cortine de gl' alti ingegni de i Dedali, e de gli Apelli, si suela a noi, e discende sopra i marmi, e sopra le tele; originata dalla natura supera l'origine, e fassi originale dell' arte, misurata dal compasso dell' intelletto, diuiene misura della mano, et animata dall' immaginatiua dà vita all' immagine.* The “idea” of the artist is an intuition, or an inspiration; it guides him in his selection of natural beauties;³ it enables him to paint angels, which he cannot have seen;⁴ it enables him to represent actions and passions which are transitory and cannot be found for long, if at all, in his model.⁵ The ancients were inspired⁶ by this idea, and their statues are to be imitated because these statues represent it: *Ci resterebbe il dire che gli antichi scultori hauendo vsato l'idea merauigliosa, come habbiamo accennato, sia però neccessario lo studio dell' antiche sculture le più perfette, perchè ci guidino alle bellezze emendate della natura.*⁷

Roland Fréart de Chambray published in 1662 a little book with a long title: *Idée de la perfection de la peinture démontrée par les principes de l'art et par les exemples conformes aux observations que Plin et Quintilien ont faites sur les célèbres tableaux des anciens peintres mis en parallèle à quelques ouvrages de nos meilleurs peintres modernes, Léonard da Vinci, Raphael, Jules Romain et le*

¹ P. 4.² P. 118.³ *Ma Zeusi . . . insegna . . . a contemplare l'idea delle migliori forme naturali, con farne scelta da vari corpi, eleggendo le più eleganti* (p. 4).⁴ As Guido Reni said; cf. *Dryden*, p. 120, and *Lionardo* on the painting of gods, *supra*, p. 49.⁵ P. 9.⁶ Cf. *Dryden*, p. 122.⁷ P. 11.

Poussin.¹ Chambray developes his "idea" as a supplement to the treatise of Lionardo, which the great painter left rather as a bundle of rough drafts than as a well composed whole,² and which, as we have observed,³ was published in Paris without the first part containing Lionardo's "idea" expressed in a "parallel." For the sake of system, Chambray follows the lead of Franciscus Junius, and speaks⁴ of the five parts which Junius declared the ancients to have observed in all their works. After deploring the degeneration of artists in his own time and extolling the genius and achievements of the Greeks,⁵ he undertakes to lead such of his contemporaries as are by nature endowed with a talent for painting in the right direction for the cultivation of it; that is, into the ways of the Greek genius. He is unequivocal in presupposing the possession of talent on the part of the painter who seeks to become excellent. "Seeing now it is not enough that to the forming of an able painter he be learned in these two points alone⁶ (which study will soon accomplish) without three or four more curious qualities, which he ought to be master of, but which are not usually attained to without a singular favor of nature, it happens that there appear so very few good workmen amongst the multitude of the profession, that it may well be verified of them which was said of the poets: that a painter is so born, not made; and really their genius is

¹ This work was translated into English by J. Evelyn and published under the title *An Idea of the perfection of painting, etc.*, London, 1668. My references are to this translation.

² P. 8.

³ *Supra*, p. 47, note 6. Besides the Italian text there was a translation into French by Chambray himself.

⁴ P. 10.

⁵ P. 4.

⁶ Viz., perspective and geometry.

so conform as it became proverbial that picture was mute poesie and poesie vocal painting.”¹ Genius is said to consist “in a certain vivacity and flowing of invention and grace (which all the study in the world will never attain).”² Similarly, “invention, or the genius of historizing and framing a noble idea upon the subject one would paint, is a particular talent, not to be acquired by study or labor; but is properly a certain ardor exciting the imagination, prompting and enabling it to act.”³ Invention and expression are the two great elements in painting. We hear nothing from Chambray specifically about the imitation of nature. Invention, the *what* in painting, naturally has preëminence;⁴ proportion and coloring are mechanical and are matters of technique; but the fourth part, “expression and motion of the spirit excels them all, and is indeed admirable; for it gives not only life to figures, by representing their gestures and passions; but seems likewise to make them vocal and to reason with you. It is from hence a man is enabled to judge of the worth and abilities of a painter; for such an artist expresses *himself* in his tables, and represents, as in so many mirrors and glasses, the temper of his own humor and genius.”⁵ Indeed, Chambray, from beginning to end treats painting as an art of expression, and the painter as a creator of significant symbols. Therefore there is nothing to surprise us in his reference to Horace’s “Art of Poetry (which is properly but the twin-brother of painting),”⁶ except the not very graceful application of Lomazzo’s definition.⁷

¹ P. 9.² P. 8.³ P. 11.⁴ P. 11.⁵ P. 14.⁶ P. 66.

⁷ *Supra*, p. 62. Chambray allows himself a very graceless diatribe on Vasari on pp. 97 ff. We may note that in objecting to some of the nudities in Michelangelo’s *Last Judgment* (pp. 15, 72) he echoes sentiments of Dolce, *Artino*, p. 244.

André Félibien, the right-hand man of Colbert, "historiographe des bâtimens du roi," secretary of the Académie des Sciences, and official reporter of the Académie de Peinture, published in his capacity as reporter seven *Conférences de l'Académie de Peinture* (1669); as an original investigator, a treatise *Des Principes de l'architecture, de la sculpture, de la peinture, et des autres arts qui en dépendent; avec un dictionnaire des termes propres à chacun de ces arts* (1676); and as an amateur of painting and a friend of painters, *Entretiens sur la vie et sur les ouvrages des plus excellents peintres anciens et modernes* (1666-88), and other works. Of these three books, only the second, *Des Principes*, is accessible to me.¹ This is rather technical than theoretical.² The high praise which de Piles gives to one of Félibien's books would make us regret the inaccessibility of all but one, if this very praise and the further facts of Félibien's early association with Poussin in Rome, and his later identification with the Académie de Peinture in Paris, did not make us certain that we should find in them all only an echo of the Academic doctrine; and this doctrine we can find still more conveniently in the *Conférences* of the Academicians

¹ In a copy of the second edition (1690) belonging to the Boston Athenæum.

² A few passages of more general purport may be quoted here. "En effet, si les paroles sont comme autant de coups de pinceau, qui forment dans l'esprit les images des choses" (preface, p. x). "Mais aussitôt il s'éleva [en Grèce] quantité d'excellents hommes qui mirent la sculpture au plus haut point, où elle ait été" (p. 305). "Les excellents hommes qui ont fait le Laocoön . . . [sont] dignes tous les trois d'une louange immortelle pour un si beau travail" (p. 305). "Le raisonnement est comme le père de la peinture et l'exécution comme la mère" (p. 399). "Dans la peinture, ce qu'on nomme ordinairement dessein est une expression apparente ou une image visible des pensées de l'esprit, et de ce qu'on s'est premièrement formé dans l'imagination" (p. 402).

themselves.¹ It is as well defined a body of precepts as those which constituted the rules of the French classical literature of the time; and, quite in the spirit of the age of Louis XIV, the Académie de Peinture, as Rocheblave says,² “*veut fixer l'esthétique de l'artiste comme l'Académie française fixe la langue, et comme Boileau va fixer la poésie.*” Under the influence of the Italian artists of the Renaissance, the French Academicians achieve their “fixation” on the basis of Greek sculpture (none too well represented) as the model for single figures, Poussin (none too well interpreted) as the model for composition of figures in groups, and Horace (*Ut pictura poesis*, misinterpreted) as the guide in a classical method of imitation of nature that shall conform to truth and reason, and shall satisfy a taste for those great things which comport with the *grand siècle*. Rocheblave has so well summarized this doctrine in its general aspects that I shall confine myself to the enumeration of some of its more significant details.

III.

But we must remember that it is de Piles's and not du Fresnoy's bibliography that we have been considering; and that, although du Fresnoy's poem deserves to be ranked with Boileau's as an expression of French classical esthetics, the poem was composed in Rome between the years 1633 and 1653—*i. e.*, a whole generation before Boileau's (1674)—and finished a decade before the Académie de Peinture obtained a new lease of life. Due

¹ Cf. Henry Jouin, *Conférences de l'Académie royale de Peinture et de Sculpture recueillies, annotées et précédées d'une étude sur les artistes écrivains*, Paris, 1883.

² *L. c.*, p. 686.

regard for chronology compels us, therefore, to introduce at this point what we have to say about *De arte graphica*.

Du Fresnoy was a man of taste and culture; well read in the literature of the ancients, a painter himself, though more competent in the theory than in the practice of his art; in no sense original, but well informed through association with painters, through extensive observation of paintings, and through acquaintance with the treatises on painting that had been produced in Italy before his time. For the form and for some of the substance of his poem, du Fresnoy is indebted to Horace; most of the numerous rules which he somewhat dogmatically lays down for the painter can be traced back to Alberti, Lionardo, and their successors; in its general bearings, his doctrine is that of Nicolas Poussin.¹ It would be an unprofitable undertaking to seek the source or even the immediate provenience of du Fresnoy's "rules." Most of them are among the commonplaces of Renaissance esthetics. Since Vitry, however, has treated this subject of sources rather cavalierly, I present herewith the results of my own investigations for what they may be worth.

Vitry says ² that besides the oral instructions of Poussin and others, the example of Horace's *Ars poetica*, and some minor works, like Armenini's *Veri precetti*, du Fresnoy profited by two books: "Leonardi da Vinci de pictura liber et amplissima Francisci Junii excerptio." He does not believe ³ du Fresnoy made much use of Lomazzo; his opinion that du Fresnoy owed much to Franciscus Junius's compendium was evidently suggested by

¹ Cf. the admirable exposition of *la méthode classique de Nicolas Poussin* given by Paul Desjardins, *La Méthode des Classiques français*, Paris, 1904, pp. 165-211.

² P. 32.

³ P. 33.

the esteem in which Poussin held this "cumulus, ne dicam liber, densus et asper";¹ and he mentions no other ground of indebtedness than the idea of the divisions of painting. There are other grounds; but this one, as I have shown above,² does not exist; and Vitry ignores Alberti and Dolce, the latter of whom is represented in du Fresnoy's compilation by ideas not found in Lionardo, Lomazzo, Armenini, or Franciscus Junius; and he ignores the author of an art of poetry nearer to du Fresnoy's hand than Horace's and, I believe, quite as useful to him, namely, Vida. Rocheblave says³ that du Fresnoy's poem is derived "pour toute la pédagogie générale . . . presque textuellement de *l'Épître aux Pisons*." The composition of the poem as a whole, and sundry details of it, seem to me to bear a strong resemblance to composition and details in the works of Vida and Dolce.

The poem *De arte graphica* (five hundred and forty-nine lines) is too short to call for formal division into parts; but it is clearly divisible into three:

I. A prologue (ll. 1-68) giving a definition of painting as a mute sister to poetry (*pictura loquens*, ll. 1-4) who treats the same subjects as poetry (ll. 5-16) and, like poetry, selects that which is worthy to be glorified and perpetuated in art (ll. 17-24). There is no need of an invocation⁴ to the muses; for the author seeks not elegance but clearness (ll. 25-29) in this endeavor to reinforce talent and instinct by knowledge and by the rules of art (ll. 30-36). The *primum praeceptum de pulchro* is the general admonition to find out what is beautiful in nature, so that the painter may choose his subject

¹ P. 36.² P. 60.³ *L. c.*, p. 698.⁴ Saintsbury humorously remarks (vol. II, p. 31) that Vida's rule appears to be "When in doubt always invoke."

after the taste and manner of the ancients (ll. 37-44), and with the freedom of truth and sovereign reason (ll. 45-53). Theory and practice are to coöperate (ll. 54-59); ancient examples are to guide in the training of talent; science is to cultivate natural disposition, and set bounds to exuberant fancy: *Est modus in rebus* (ll. 60-68).

II. The "art of painting" proper (ll. 69-420) in a discussion of the details of the three elements, invention, design, and coloring (including chiaroscuro). Invention, which is a fruit of inspiration, has to do with the conception and effective expression of an idea (ll. 69-92). Before proceeding to the second element, the poet inserts a few lines (93-102) on the history of painting, saying that the art, which originated in Egypt, was perfected in Greece. Design (*graphis seu positura, secunda picturae pars*) includes (ll. 103-252) the representation and adjustment of the parts of single figures, composition of groups, adornment, expression, and style. Coloring (*chromatice, tertia pars picturae*, ll. 253-420), the distinctive element in painting, is treated in a series of technical precepts.

III. An epilogue (ll. 421-549) on the character, training, occupation, and virtues of a painter, culminating in brief encomiums upon Raphael (ll. 519 f.) for invention, Michelangelo (l. 521) for design, Giulio Romano (ll. 522-528) for the poetry of painting (*graphica poesis*), Correggio (ll. 529-532) for lights, shadows, and colors, Titian (ll. 533-535) for *amicitia, gradus, dolique colorum, compagesque*, and Annibale Caracci (ll. 535 f.) for sedulous and assimilative eclecticism. There is an *envoi* to Louis XIII of France.

Vida's plan is thus set forth by Batteux:¹ "Son *Art poétique*, que Jules Scaliger² préfère à celui d'Horace est écrit avec autant de méthode et de jugement que d'élégance et de goût. Il est divisé en trois chants. Dans le premier, il traite de l'éducation du poète, de la manière de lui former le goût et l'oreille: il indique les auteurs qu'il doit lire; après quoi il crayonne en peu de mots l'origine et l'histoire de la poésie. Dans le second, il parle de l'invention des choses et de leur disposition, surtout dans l'épopée, qu'il semble avoir eue seule en vue dans son ouvrage, qui n'est proprement que la pratique de Virgile réduite en art, ou en principes. Dans le troisième il traite de l'élocution poétique, sur laquelle il donne des détails très instructifs. Il y traite surtout de l'harmonie imitative des vers, avec une clarté et une précision qu'on ne trouve point même chez ceux qui en ont écrit en prose."

There is an obvious similarity between Vida's invention, disposition, and elocution,³ and du Fresnoy's invention, design and coloring, as well as between Vida's three cantos and the three parts into which du Fresnoy's poem naturally falls. But du Fresnoy is more systematic. He proceeds from the generalities of definition to particular rules touching the theory and practice of his art; and thence to the treatment of these matters in their personal aspect—that is, their application in the training of the novice, and their illustration in the careers of celebrated

¹ *L. c.*, II, 3. Vida's *Art of Poetry* with the translation of Pitt is conveniently accessible in *The Art of Poetry* edited by A. S. Cook, Boston, 1892, pp. 39 ff.

² *Poet.*, lib. VI, p. 740, ed. 1617.

³ "Expression, and all that belongs to words, is that in a poem which coloring is in a picture" (Dryden, *Parallel*, Ker, II, p. 147). "*Operum colores* is the very word which Horace uses to signify words and elegant expressions" (*ibid.*, p. 148).

artists. Du Fresnoy's third part corresponds to Vida's first. But if Vida had placed his first canto last, he would have made its admonitions more impressive, and he would not have been tempted to turn his tracks as he did when, at the end of his third canto, he resumed admonishing. It may be conceived that du Fresnoy, having written his prologue independently of Vida, as he must have done from the nature of its theme, paralleled in his second part Vida's second canto and the major portion of Vida's third; and in his epilogue covered the ground of Vida's first canto and the last part of Vida's third. I do not mean that du Fresnoy consciously performed any such operation, though this is not incredible. But I do think it probable that he knew and used Vida; and whether he knew him or not, there is some historical importance attaching to the resemblances between the two works; for agreement with Vida emphasizes the extent to which *De arte graphica* is an "art of the poetry of painting."

Vida writes (II, 455 ff.):

"Praeterea haud lateat te nil conarier artem
Naturam nisi ut assimulet, propiusque sequatur.
Hanc unam vates sibi proposuere magistram;
Quidquid agunt, hujus semper vestigia servant,
Hinc varios moresque hominum, moresque animantum,
Aut studia imparibus divisa aetatibus apta
Effingunt facie verborum; et imagine reddunt
Quae tardosque senes deceant, juvenesque virentes,
Foemineumque genus, quantum quoque rura colenti,
Aut famulo distet regum alto e sanguine cretus.
Nam mihi non placeat teneros si sit gravis annos
Telemachus supra, senior si Nestor inani
Gaudeat et ludo, et canibus, pictisve pharetris."

The word *verborum* (l. 461) omitted, this passage might stand unchanged in *De arte graphica*: du Fresnoy's phraseology is different, but he gives to painters the same advice that Vida gives to poets. Du Fresnoy says:

- “Denique quaecumque in caelo, terraque, marique
Longius in tempus durare, ut pulchra, merentur,
Nobilitate sua, claroque insignia casu,
Dives et ampla manet pictores atque poetas
Materies” (ll. 17-21).
- “Praecipua imprimis artisque potissima pars est,
Nosse quid in rebus natura crearit ad artem
Pulchrius, idque modum juxta, mentemque vetustam” (ll. 37-39).
- “Nam quamcumque modo servili haud sufficit ipsam
Naturam exprimere ad vivum; sed ut arbiter artis,
Seliget ex illa tantum pulcherrima pictor.
Quodque minus pulchrum, aut mendosum corrigit ipse
Marte suo, formae Veneres captando fugaces” (ll. 49-53).
- “Non ita naturae astanti sis cuique revinctus,
Hanc praeter nihil ut genio studioque relinquo;
Nec sine teste rei natura, artisque magistra,
Quidlibet ingenio, memor ut tantummodo rerum,
Pingere posse putes” (ll. 177-181).
- “Sed juxta antiquos naturam, imitabere pulchram,
Qualem forma rei propria, objectumque requirit” (ll. 184 f.).
- “Naturae sit ubique tenor, ratioque sequenda” (l. 224).

It appears, then, that for du Fresnoy nature is the great mistress of art, and that the modern artist corrects the imperfections of nature and makes selection of natural beauties according to the bent of his genius and the fulness of his knowledge. Beautiful nature, the taste of the ancients, and the choice of reason are all one and the same thing. Invention is a kind of muse (l. 76), and her suggestions are the inscrutable gifts of Apollo (l. 77); but execution is an acquisition made through practice (l. 54) guided by science (l. 65). Hence it is of the utmost importance that a youth should have a competent instructor:

“Picturam ita nil sub limine primo
Ingrediens, puer, offendit damnosius arti,
Quam varia errorum genera, ignorante magistro,
Ex pravis libare typis, mentemque veneno
Inficere in toto quod non abstergitur aevo” (ll. 422-426).

Vida, who on his part is very solicitous that the young poet should have a competent instructor (I, 216 ff.), says, in the verses quoted above, that art follows nature as closely as possible, and imitates all natural peculiarities of time, place, and condition; and advises the poet—as du Fresnoy advises the painter (ll. 14, 37, 53, 470 ff.)—to observe rustic life (I, 341), to study geography and the customs of different nations (I, 391); but especially to consult ancient authors (I, 382), to let no day pass without a visit¹ to the founts of their inspired eloquence (I, 410), to take counsel of orators and teachers of eloquence (II, 496), but more especially of the Greeks (II, 547); for the ancients are the supreme authorities in elocution (III, 210), above all, Virgil (III, 554 ff.). Spingarn points out² that Vida took the authority of the ancients on trust, and that for him imitation of nature meant imitation of them; whereas, “for Boileau, the classics are to be followed on the authority of nature and reason . . . Boileau . . . showed that the ancients were simply imitating nature itself in the closest and keenest manner, and that by imitating the classics the poet was not imitating a second and different nature, but was being shown in the surest way how to imitate the real and only nature. This final reconciliation of the imitation of nature and the imitation of the classics was Boileau’s highest contribution to the literary criticism of the neo-classical period.” It must be added that this reconciliation, or synthesis, is distinctly foreshadowed in du Fresnoy. Nevertheless, although du Fresnoy is far in advance

¹ Du Fresnoy has the line (469): “Nulla dies abeat, quin linea ducta supersit.” Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xxxv, § 84, records this precept as a rule of Apelles, and adds, *quod ab eo in proverbium venit*.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 131, 135.

of Vida in this matter, he follows Vida closely in the essential elements of his exposition. Both say essentially the same things on the relation of theory to practice, of talent to knowledge, of inspiration to judgment, and of impulse to choice.

Du Fresnoy insists with hardly less emphasis than Lionardo that painting is a science, and he concerns himself nearly as much with the question *what* the artist shall paint as with the question *how* he shall paint it. He repeatedly refers ¹ to the gap between the head that conceives and the hand that executes; and by anticipation he answers the question that Lessing ² puts into the mouth of Conti: "Oder meinen Sie, Prinz, dass Raphael nicht das grösste malerische Genie gewesen wäre, wenn er unglücklicherweise ohne Hände wäre geboren worden?" On the relation of theory and practice du Fresnoy writes (ll. 54-59):

"Utque manus grandi nil nomine practica dignum
Assequitur, purum arcanæ quam deficit artis
Lumen, et in præceps abitura ut caeca vagatur;
Sic nihil ars opera manuum privata supremum
Exequitur, sed languet iners uti vincta lacertos;
Dispositumque typum non lingua pinxit Apelles."

The latter part of Vida's first canto contains numerous passages describing the efforts of the young poet to master the practical elements of his art,

"Sermontum memor antiquis quos vatibus hausit" (I, 423),

such as this, for example (I, 430-433),

"Nec mora, nec requies, dubio sententia surgit
Multa animo, variatque, omnes convertitur anceps
In facies, nescitque etiam notissima, et haeret
Attonitus."

¹E. g., 11, 31, 464, 494.

²Emilia Galotti, I, 4.

For the author of a manual of rules, du Fresnoy takes a very conservative ground when he speaks of the relation of talent and knowledge. He protests (ll. 30-36),

“Nec mihi mens animusve fuit constringere nodos
Artificum manibus, quos tantum dirigit usus ;
Indolis ut vigor inde potens obstrictus hebescat,
Normarum numero immani, geniumque moretur ;
Sed rerum ut pollens ars cognitione, gradatim
Naturae sese insinuet, verique capacem
Transeat in genium, geniusque usu induat artem.”

And again (ll. 60-66),

“Ergo licet tota normam haud possimus in arte
Ponere (cum nequeant quae sunt pulcherrima dici)
Nitimur haec paucis, scrutati summa magistræ
Dogmata naturae, artisque exemplaria primæ
Altius intuiti ; sic mens, habilisque facultas
Indolis excolitur, geniumque scientia complet ;
Luxuriansque in monstra furor compescitur arte.”

Vida is equally cautious (I, 362 f.),

“Saepe tamen cultusque frequens et cura docentum
Imperat ingeniis, naturaque flectitur arte.”

And he gives the same caution (II, 445 ff.),

“Ne tamen ah nimium puer, o ne fide calori,
Non te fortuna semper permittimus uti,
Praesentique aura, saevum dum pectore numen
Insidet ; at potius ratioque, et cura resistat.
Freno siste furem animum, et sub signa vocato,
Et premere, et laxas scito dare cautus habenas,
Atque ideo semper tunc expectare jubemus,
Dum fuerint placati animi, compressus et omnis
Impetus. Hic recolens sedato corde revise
Omnia, quae caecus menti subjecerit ardor.”

According to du Fresnoy, invention is the incommunicable benefit of divine inspiration (ll. 87 ff.):

"Ista labore gravi, studio monitisque magistri
 Ardua pars nequit addisci rarissima : namque,
 Ne prius aethereo rapuit quod ab axe Prometheus
 Sit jubar infusum menti cum flamine vitae,
 Mortali haud cuivis divina haec munera dantur ;
 Non uti Daedaleam licet omnibus ire Corinthum."

Vida, though less outspoken, recognizes the same inspiration in the same function (II, 11 ff.) :

"Nam mihi nunc reperire apta, atque reperta docendum
 Digerere, atque suo quaeque ordine rite locare.
 Durus uterque labor. Sed quos Deus aspicit aequus,
 Saepe suis subito invenient accommoda votis,
 Altera nempe arti tantum est obnoxia cura,
 Unde solent laudem in primis optare poetae."

In another passage (II, 395 ff.) Vida attributes productivity directly to inspired enthusiasm :

"Quid cum animis sacer est furor additus, atque potens vis ?

 Dii potius ! felixque ideo qui tempora quivit,
 Adventumque Dei, et sacrum expectare calorem,
 Paulisperque operi posito subducere mentem,
 Mutati donec redeat clementia coeli."

But both du Fresnoy and Vida claim for the judgment control even over inspiration. Each admonishes his disciple to be critical of himself before, during, and after executing his design ; and to profit by the criticisms of others. Du Fresnoy (II. 440 ff.) :

"Nec prius inducas tabulae pigmenta colorum,
 Expensi quam signa typi stabilita nitescant,
 Et menti praesens operis sit pegma futuri.

 Utere doctorum monitis, nec sperne superbus
 Discere, quae de te fuerit sententia vulgi.
 Est caecus nam quisque suis in rebus, et expers
 Iudicii, prolemque suam miratur amatque.
 Ast ubi consilium deerit sapientis amici,
 Id tempus dabit, atque mora intermissa labori."

Vida, like Horace¹ before him, holds that "scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons." Vida says (I, 75 ff.),

"Quin etiam prius effigiem formare solutis
Totiusque operis simulacrum fingere verbis
Proderit, atque omnes ex ordine nectere partes.
Et seriem rerum, et certos tibi ponere fines,
Per quos tuta regens vestigia tendere pergas."

Vida believes in encouraging the young poet so far as possible, but also in criticizing him benevolently (I, 474); he cautions the mature poet to be in no haste to publish his verses, to seek rigorous judges, and after the lapse of time to return to his work and judge it severely himself (III, 455 ff.).

The delicate distinction between following one's native impulse and exercising a judicious choice, which is another aspect of the relations of talent and inspiration to knowledge and judgment, du Fresnoy and Vida draw alike. The artist in colors and the artist in words are both bidden to avoid subjects unsuited to their genius, to follow their genius in making choice of subjects or of details of treatment; but at the same time to choose in accordance with the canons of the ancients, and to select the beautiful from among the forms of nature. Du Fresnoy says² (II, 491-493),

"Et quamcumque voles occasio porrigat ansam,
Ni genius quidam adfuerit, sydusque benignum,
Dotibus his tantis, nec adhuc ars tanta paratur."

¹ In view of the general resemblance of *De arte graphica* to Vida's poem, and its difference from Horace's and from such other poetics as, e. g., Minturno's (1559, 1563), and that of Vauquelin de la Fresnaye (1605), the fact that most of the points here enumerated were made by Horace, and might have been derived by du Fresnoy, as they were by Vida, from Horace, does not seem to make the enumeration and comparison otiose.

² Cf. II, 30 ff., *supra*, p. 80; I, 39, *supra*, p. 77; II, 50 ff., *supra*, p. 77.

Vida is of the same mind:

“Tu vero ipse humeros explorans consule primum,
Atque tuis prudens genus elige viribus aptum” (I, 39 f.).
“Quid deceat, quid non, tibi nostri ostendere possunt.
Inventa ex aliis disce, et te plurima Achivos
Consulere hortamur veteres, Argivaque regna
Explorare oculis, et opimam avertere gazam
In Latium, atque domum laetum spolia ampla referre.
Haud minor est adeo virtus, si te audit Apollo,
Inventa Argivum in patriam convertere vocem,
Quam si tute aliquid intactum inveneris ante” (II, 541 ff.).¹
“Atque ideo ex priscis semper quo more loquamur
Discendum, quorum depascimur aurea dicta,
Praecipuumque avidi rerum populamus honorem.
Aspice ut exuvias, veterumque insignis nobis
Aptemus. Rerum accipimus nunc clara reperta,
Nunc seriem, atque animum verborum, verba quoque ipsa.
Nec pudet interdum alterius nos ore locutos” (III, 210 ff.).

It is evident, however, that du Fresnoy does not tie the hands of his pupil as Vida ties the hands of his; and that du Fresnoy leads the way from ancient art to nature, neither ancient nor modern, as Vida does not—and this for other reasons than that Vida could hold up examples of ancient poetry to the eyes of his pupil; whereas ancient painting was known to du Fresnoy only in descriptions. Du Fresnoy followed the ancients as guides; Vida copied them as models, or plundered them.

Finally, on the necessary character and training of the novice, du Fresnoy and Vida are in substantial agreement. The qualities that du Fresnoy presupposes are:

“Judicium, docile ingenium, cor nobile, sensus
Sublimes, firmum corpus, florensque juvenia,
Commoda res, labor, artis amor” (ll. 488 ff.).

The days of ardent youth are the time to begin with the

¹ Spingarn remarks (pp. 131 ff.), that Vida's “imitation” hardly looks beyond spoliation and translation of the ancients.

art (ll. 500 ff.) ; and this the mode of life for the painter to lead :

“Non epulis nimis indulget pictura, meroque
 Parcit : amicorum nisi cum sermone benigno
 Exhaustum reparet mentem recreata ; sed inde
 Litibus, et curis, in caelibe libera vita,
 Secessus procul a turba, strepituque remotos,
 Villarum, rurisque beata silentia quaerit.
 Namque recollecto, tota incumbente Minerva,
 Ingenio, rerum species praesentior extat ;
 Commodiusque operis compagem amplectitur omnem” (ll. 475-483).

Vida's whole poem is addressed to the young poet, as we are especially reminded throughout the first part ;

“Nulli etenim insignem dabitur gestare coronam,
 Pieridum choreas teneris nisi norit ab annis” (l. 84 f.) ;

his first book is a conspectus of good qualities ; he urges the poet to love his art, and despise riches (I, 507 ; cf. Du Fresnoy, l. 478) ; to beware of the distractions of love (I, 365) ; to go among men and roam the fields (I, 340 ff.). He points out that some are born to excel at the bar (I, 360), and others to be poets. But Vida is too much a man of the court and the society of the cultivated to recommend the life of rustic solitude which du Fresnoy extols probably because it was the mode of life of Poussin.

Enough has been quoted from Vida to show that he has nothing useful to say on the relations of poetry and painting. For him, poetry is first of all epic poetry ; and his poem ends with an apotheosis of Virgil. But when du Fresnoy says “poetry” he means dramatic poetry. The second line of *De arte graphica* calls painting and poetry sisters ; but in line eighty-five painting is bidden

“Tragicae sed lege sorosis [ornamenta],
 Summa ubi res agitur, vis summa requiritur artis.”

This specialization of the meaning in which the word "poetry" is used is obviously of great importance; for the drama is in a real sense visible poetry; dramatic scenes lend themselves to fixation and perpetuation on canvas in a far higher degree than the less distinct moments of an epic action—to say nothing of the invisible substance of lyric poetry. A dumb show may be perfectly intelligible; and from the confessions of Otto Ludwig¹ we learn that a series of depictable scenes, with groups of persons standing in characteristic attitudes and making expressive gestures, but without causal connection, may be the skeleton of a drama. Conversely, the substance of a drama is easily reducible to a succession of depicted scenes; and painting is a sister art to *dramatic* poetry.

This point, among others, was made by Dolce. The *Aretino* is primarily a dialogue on the respective merits of Michelangelo and Raphael. But for the better establishment of his case, Aretino, speaking for Dolce, lays a firm foundation of general principles, defines, elaborates, and expounds the art of painting, and finally, preferring Raphael to Michelangelo, summarily indicates the claims to distinction of a number of other painters from Lionardo da Vinci on, and rises in a climax of ten pages² to a glorification of the merits of Titian. Dolce's plan is fundamentally similar to du Fresnoy's; he divides the art of painting into the same three parts as du Fresnoy;³ he associates painting with the drama in the same way that du Fresnoy does; and the opinions that du Fresnoy expresses about representative artists at the end of his poem are also, so far as they go, the opinions of Dolce.

¹ *Schriften*, ed. Stern, Leipzig, 1891, vol. VI, p. 215: *Mein Verfahren beim poetischen Schaffen*.

² Pp. 280 ff.

³ Cf. *supra*, p. 58.

In answer to an observation of Aretino's concerning suitable composition of scenes, the interlocutor, Fabrini, remarks,¹ *Questo istesso insegna Aristotele nella sua Poetica a gli scrittori di tragedie e di comedie*; and Aretino continues with an account of the way that Timanthes depicted the sacrifice of Iphigenia as it was lately seen on the stage in Venice in a translation of Euripides made by Dolce himself. Aretino warns² against exceeding the *numero convenevole di figure* in a picture, and Fabrini again refers to the drama: *Così vogliono i giudiciosi, che si dia al poema; e massimamente alle comedie et alle tragedie, una lunghezza mediocre; adducendo per ragione, che se una cosa animata è troppo grande, è abhorrita; se troppo picciola, vien dileggiata*.³ Of Raphael, Dolce wrote,⁴ *Perciochè oltre la invention: oltre al disegno: oltre alla varietà: oltre che le sue cose tutte muovono sommamente: si trova in loro quella parte, che havevano, come scrive Plinio, le figure di Apelle: e questa è la venustà, che è quel non so che, che tanto suole aggradire, così ne' pittori, come ne' poeti, in guisa, che empie l'animo altrui d'infinito diletto, non sapendo da qual parte esca quello, che a noi tanto piace*. Dolce concedes⁵ to Michelangelo great excellence in design. Giulio, he says,⁶ was *bell' inventore, buon disegnatore e coloriva benissimo. Ma fu vinto di colorito, e di più gentil maniera da Antonio da Correggio*,

¹ P. 160.² P. 174.³ Du Fresnoy wrote (ll. 152 ff.):

"Pluribus implicitum personis drama supremo
In genere ut rarum est; multis ita densa figuris
Rarior est tabula excellens."

De Piles annotates (Dryden, p. 137): "Annibal Caracci did not believe that a picture could be good, in which there were above twelve figures. It was Albano who told our author this; and from his mouth I had it."

⁴ P. 262.⁵ P. 86.⁶ P. 274.

leggiadrissimo maestro. Of Titian, his friend and idol, Dolce cannot say enough: *Nè è maraviglia: perciocchè in costui solo veramente (e sia detto con pace de gli altri pittori) si veggono raccolte a perfettione tutte le parti eccellenti, che si sono trovate divise in molti.*¹

IV.

I shall treat the doctrine of the Académie de Peinture under the three heads enumerated above,² after Rocheblave: namely, in its relation to Greek sculpture, in its theory of composition, and in its theory of expression. In the details of this discussion we not only shall get corroborative testimony about the French "classical method," but also shall find more than one anticipation even of such a pioneer as Winckelmann.

It is no accident that one of the earliest of the *Conférences* had for its subject *la figure principale du groupe de Laocoön*. On the second of July, 1667, the sculptor Gérard van Opstal demonstrated³ to the satisfaction of the assembled Academicians that this figure, representing a man of high birth, a hero, a person of quality, of grand, noble, and beautiful form, was a perfect specimen of the artistic imitation of "la belle nature." This statue has no equal. It deserves to be studied, it has already been studied by the greatest sculptors and painters, as a model not only of expressions that cannot be found in a human model, but also of beauties that cannot be found in nature. "Il n'y eut personne qui ne convînt que c'est sur ce modèle qu'on peut apprendre à corriger même les défauts qui se

¹ P. 280.² P. 71.³ Jouin, pp. 19-26. Text as reported by Félibien.

trouvent d'ordinaire dans le naturel; car tout y paraît dans un état de perfection, et tel qu'il semble que la nature ferait tous ses ouvrages, s'il ne se rencontrait des obstacles qui l'empêchent de leur donner une forme parfaite."¹

Van Opstal's attitude towards Greek sculpture represented by Laocoön appears to be that of unquestioning submission. So was the attitude of the painter Sébastien Bourdon in a lecture entitled *l'étude de l'antique*,² and delivered July 5, 1670. Indeed, for Bourdon one ancient statue is as good as another, the "Hercule Commode, par exemple, ou bien . . . telle autre statue dont il [le jeune peintre] se sentirait plus particulièrement affecté et qui serait plus fraîchement imprimée dans sa mémoire." Bourdon holds that the pupil should acquaint himself with the proportions of ancient statues, should design after them, and, when he has designed from a living model, should subsequently correct his drawing according to the proportions of the marble one.

But such unreasoning subserviency was not the high-water mark of Academic attainment. In the discussion following Philippe de Champaigne's lecture³ on Poussin's *Eliézer et Rebecca*, January 7, 1668, Le Brun defended Poussin against the charge of having too closely imitated the ancients, and said that Poussin "ayant étudié et découvert les véritables effets de la nature, à l'envie des habiles gens de l'antiquité, il en avait fait comme eux un bon choix et un bon usage, et ne pouvait manquer de se rencontrer avec leurs idées; que si on ne fait ces distinctions, on aura l'injustice d'accuser tous les grands ouvriers de l'antiquité de s'être copiés l'un l'autre, puisqu'ayant pris la nature et la vrai pour modèles, il a fallu de nécessité qu'ils aient gardé dans leurs figures les mêmes

¹ P. 21.² Jouin, pp. 137-140.³ Jouin, pp. 87-98.

proportions et suivi les mêmes principes; qu'à la vérité les Grecs ont eu de grands avantages sur nous, parce que leur pays produisait ordinairement des personnes mieux faites que le nôtre, et leur fournissait de plus beaux modèles; qu'ils portaient des habits qui ne leur gênaient point le corps et ne gâtaient rien à la forme des parties apparentes; que même ces habits ne leur couvraient le corps qu'à demi, ce qui donnait la commodité à leurs peintres et à leurs sculpteurs d'en mieux observer les beautés; que, pour plus de facilité, ils avaient incessamment devant les yeux de jeunes esclaves presque tous nus, outre les athlètes robustes et bien faits dont les spectacles fréquents donnaient à ces excellents ouvriers une ample matière d'étude et de perfection."¹ M. de Champagne having remarked with some surprise that Poussin omitted from his picture the camels that the Scripture narrative expressly mentions in connection with the story of Rebecca, Le Brun pointed out that this omission was not due to ignorance nor to indifference, but was made because the camel is not a comely creature. Le Brun continued: "M. Poussin, ayant considéré les espèces particulières des sujets qu'il traitait, y supprimait les objets qui à force d'être dissemblables, y auraient été difformes, et il les regardait comme de légères circonstances qui, étant retranchées, ne faisaient aucun préjudice à l'histoire. Il disait que la poésie en usait ainsi et ne permettait pas que dans un même sujet l'expression aisée et familière du poème comique se mêlât avec la pompe et la gravité de l'héroïque. M. Le Brun ajouta encore aux remarques de M. Poussin

¹ Pp. 91 f. The agreement of these observations with the reasons given by Winckelmann (*Gedanken über die Nachahmung*, DLD 20, pp. 9-14) why the Greeks were a beautiful race, and why, therefore, beauty is more easily discoverable in their statues than in nature, is certainly striking. This text, however, was not published until 1854 (Jouin, p. 99).

que la poésie évitait même le récit des actions bizarres dans un ouvrage sérieux.”¹

These sentiments show Le Brun very near to Boileau, and to du Fresnoy—and correspondingly in advance of Vida—in his conception of the sanction of ancient examples, and quite at one with du Fresnoy in conceiving painting as an art of expression like poetry. The best expounder of painting as an art of expression is, however, the painter Henri Testelin in his lecture *l'expression générale et particulière*, delivered on June sixth, 1675.² Composition for the sake of expression is Testelin's watch-word; and in his view, the painter's procedure is identical with the poet's. “On dit que le peintre devait tellement assujettir toutes les parties qui entrent en la composition de son tableau qu'elles concourent ensemble à former une juste idée du sujet, en sorte qu'elles puissent inspirer dans l'esprit des regardants des émotions convenables à cette idée, et que s'il se rencontrait dans la narration de l'histoire même, quelque circonstance qui y fût contraire, on la devait supprimer ou si fort négliger qu'elle n'y pût faire aucune interruption; qu'on peut néanmoins prendre une discrète liberté de choisir des incidents favorables, ou quelque allégorie qui convienne au sujet pour la variété du contraste; mais que l'on doit éviter de faire paraître ensemble des choses incompatibles.”³ “Par l'écriture l'on peut bien faire une ample description de toutes les circonstances qui arrivent en une suite de temps, lesquelles on ne peut concevoir que successivement; mais qu'en la peinture l'on doit comprendre tout d'un coup

¹ P. 94.

² Jouin, pp. 153–167. Published in 1680 in the author's *Sentiments des plus habiles peintres sur la pratique de la peinture et sculpture*.

³ P. 153.

l'idée du sujet; qu'ainsi un peintre se doit restreindre à ces trois unités, a savoir: ce qui arrive en un seul temps; ce que la vue peut découvrir d'une seule œillade; et ce qui se peut représenter dans l'espace d'un tableau, où l'idée de l'expression se doit rassembler à l'endroit du héros du sujet, comme la perspective assujettit tout à un seul point." ¹ "L'Académie approuvant ces raisonnements détermina que le peintre se doit attacher aux caractères qui conviennent à l'idée du sujet et négliger les circonstances qui n'y sont pas absolument essentielles." ² The aim being always to bring out the full spiritual content of the subject, the painter will not hesitate to join angels or allegorical figures to groups of human beings. "Ce serait faire une injustice à un peintre doué d'un excellent génie de l'empêcher de joindre l'allégorie à l'histoire pour en exprimer les mystères, lorsqu'on le peut faire sans nuire à l'intelligence du sujet; qu'il serait à souhaiter, au contraire, que les peintres, en ne négligeant rien de ce qui est essentiel à leur profession, appliquassent leur esprit à bien connaître le sens mystique des histoires aussi bien que le littéral, leurs ouvrages en seraient beaucoup plus considérables et satisferaient davantage la curiosité des amateurs savants." ³ "Il y a des fictions et des allégories qui conviennent à des sujets saints et d'autres pour les sujets profanes; chacun sait que les corps qu'on attribue aux anges ne sont que des figures symboliques, et l'on ne voit personne trouver à redire qu'on en représente dans les histoires saintes, d'où l'on conclut qu'un peintre peut bien accompagner l'expression de son sujet de quelques figures allégoriques pour marquer et citer le lieu où il se rencontre, mais comme par des statues qui n'ont nulle part aux mouvements des figures

¹ P. 154.² P. 157.³ P. 158.

qui expriment le sujet; que, n'ayant que cette sorte de langage pour exprimer ses belles conceptions, il ne serait pas juste de lui en ôter la liberté; c'est ce qui a fait dire que la peinture est une poésie muette et la rhétorique des peintres."¹

V.

Roger de Piles published his edition of *De arte graphica* seven years before Testelin delivered his lecture on expression. But Testelin's ideas were those of the Academy, and by no means date from the year of their formulation by him. In many respects de Piles departs from the Academic doctrine. For Poussin and ancient form he substitutes Rubens and modern color; next to Rubens he places van Dyck; and he subjects the Italian artists of the Renaissance to a new test of rank according to color and expression. His notes to du Fresnoy give evidence of considerable independence of judgment at the same time that they show a proper respect for the views and opinions of his friend and author. De Piles was himself a painter, engraver, and diplomat, as well as a writer on art. Among his paintings are said to have been portraits of Anne Dacier and Nicolas Boileau; and Vitry prefixes to his book an engraved portrait of du Fresnoy by him which gives evidence of no little talent. De Piles was an *artiste écrivain*. His most important works are, besides the annotated translation of du Fresnoy, a *Cours de peinture par principes* (1708) and an *Abrégé de la vie des peintres* (1715).

De Piles begins his notes to du Fresnoy with a "parallel" between painting and poetry, explaining that both

¹ P. 158.

aim at imitation, aim to excite our passions, to produce illusion, to reproduce the heroic, and to eternize heroes.¹ In these aims painting has the advantage over poetry in speaking a universal language, and in appealing to the supreme sense of sight. The general rule of "imitation" by no means suffices for the painter. Apropos of du Fresnoy's precept of choice (l. 37) de Piles bids us "observe here the rock on which the greatest part of the Flemish painters have split. Most of that nation know how to imitate nature at least as well as the painters of other countries; but they make a bad choice in nature itself; whether it be that they have not seen the ancient pieces, to find those beauties; or that a happy genius and the beautiful nature is not the growth of their country. These ancient works from their beginning have been the rule of beauty."² Ancient statues are more perfect than nature because the sculptors selected beauties from many models "to compose from them a beautiful whole. . . . 'Tis also to be presumed that in the choice which they made of those parts they followed the opinion of physicians, who in that time were very capable of instructing them in the rules of beauty; since beauty and health ordinarily follow each other."³

The grounds upon which de Piles upholds the authority of the ancients thus appear to be rationalistic enough. He even goes a step farther, making, as Vitry observes,⁴ a point against Poussin,⁵ but also differentiating between

¹ Pp. 82 f. of Dryden's translation (edition of 1750) from which I quote in modernized orthography.

² P. 91.

³ P. 92. Winckelmann also emphasizes the health of the Greeks as a prime element in their beauty. *Gedanken*, DLD 20, p. 12.

⁴ P. 17.

⁵ "Dans la plupart de ses tableaux le nud de ses figures tient beaucoup de la pierre peinte, et porte avec lui plutôt la dureté des marbres que la

two arts that Lessing would have done well to avoid confusing under the common designation of *Malerei*. "We are here to observe that painters are not obliged to follow the antique as exactly as the sculptors; for then the picture would savor too strongly of the statue, and would seem to be without motion. . . . It therefore becomes the painters to make use of those ancient patterns with discretion, and to accommodate the nature¹ to them in such a manner that their figures, which must seem to live, may rather appear to be models for the antique than the antique a model for their figures."²

A long passage on drapery³ illustrates the difference between sculpture and painting. The ancient sculptors, perceiving the awkwardness of large folds and heavy materials, which would conceal the lines of the figure and necessitate large masses of stone, preferred clinging garments of light stuffs which, to be sure, made many wrinkles at the extremities and the joints, but allowed the warmth of the flesh to be felt through the garment, and made possible a number of delicate effects of carving besides. The painters, on the contrary, for whom heavy stuffs and large masses are only so many more opportunities for effective coloring, "are bound to imitate the different sorts of garments, such as they naturally seem"; whereas those "who have scrupulously tied themselves to the practice of the ancients in their draperies have made their works

délicatesse d'une chair pleine de sang et de vie" (*Vie des peintres*, p. 466). Referred to by Vitry, *l. c.*

¹ By "accomodating the nature" de Piles means expressing an ideal. On a later page (p. 98) he says we must learn "to understand what is perfect and beautiful in nature: to the end that, having found it, we may be able to imitate it, and by this instruction we may be capacitated to observe those errors which she herself has made and to avoid them."

² P. 96.

³ Pp. 142 ff.

crude and dry; and by this means have found out the lamentable secret how to make their figures harder than even the marble itself."

As to the demand for superior liveliness and mobility in painted figures, de Piles does not elsewhere attribute a greater repose to sculpture; but he does insist upon animation in painting. Commenting upon du Fresnoy's "*formae Veneres fugaces*" (l. 53), he says,¹ "Those fugitive or transient beauties are no other than such as we observe in nature with a short and transient view, and which remain not long in their subjects. Such are the passions of the soul. There are of this sort of beauties which last but for a moment; as the different airs of an assembly upon the sight of an unexpected and uncommon object; some particularity of a violent passion; some graceful action; a smile, a glance of an eye, a disdainful look, a look of gravity, and a thousand other such like things; we may also place in the catalogue of these flying beauties fine clouds, such as ordinarily follow thunder or a shower of rain." And again:² painting replaces "the history before our eyes as if the thing were at this very time effectively in action; even so far, that beholding the pictures wherein those noble deeds are represented, we find ourselves stung with the desire of endeavoring somewhat which is like that action there expressed, as if we were reading it in the history." The passions of the soul sensibly alter the appearance of the body, and it is the business of painters in their imitation of bodies to express all the degrees and species of passion; "for they will make, for example, six persons in the same degree of fear who shall express that passion all of them differently. And 'tis that diversity of species which distinguishes those

¹ P. 99f.

² P. 106.

painters who are able artists from those whom we may call mannerists, and who repeat five or six times over in the same picture the same airs of a head.”¹ A picture, which is mute, imitates the gestures and actions by means of which mutes express their thoughts and passions.² Imitation, however, be it repeated, is no servile copying³ of real mutes or other natural creatures or objects; nor is it the method of “those who paint everything by practice, without being able to subject themselves to retouch anything, or to examine by the nature. These last, properly speaking, are the libertines of painting . . . [who] have no other model but a rhodomontado genius, and very irregular, which violently hurries them away.”⁴ The ultimate test of the validity of a picture is the degree of its approach to being a witness to the truth: “the nearer a picture approaches to the truth, the better it is.”⁵

The definition of pictorial truth is the first task to which de Piles addresses himself in the *Cours de peinture*. Having declared, “l’essence et la définition de la peinture est l’imitation des objets visibles par le moyen de la forme et des couleurs,”⁶ the painter’s purpose being “de séduire nos yeux”;⁷ de Piles concludes, “il faut que tous ses objets peints paraissent vrais . . . parce que le vrai dans la peinture est la base de toutes les autres parties qui relèvent l’excellence de cet art”;⁸ “car toutes les parties de la peinture ne valent qu’autant qu’elles portent le caractère de ce vrai”⁹—and is then face to face with Pilate’s

¹ P. 157.² P. 133; cf. du Fresnoy, l. 128.³ P. 139.⁴ P. 139 f.⁵ P. 140.⁶ P. 3.⁷ P. 4.⁸ P. 7 f.

⁹ P. 21. De Piles carries his requirement of verisimilitude so far as to narrate with evident relish how Rembrandt deceived the passers-by into imagining a picture of his servant displayed in a window was the maiden herself (p. 10), and to affirm (p. 17) that the essence of painting is “de surprendre les yeux et de les tromper, s’il est possible.”

question, what is truth? Though all men are liars, truth is the goal of all their endeavors. "Rien n'est bon, rien ne plaît sans le vrai; c'est la raison, c'est l'équité, c'est le bon sens et la base de toutes les perfections, c'est le but des sciences; et tous les arts qui ont pour objet l'imitation ne s'exercent que pour instruire et pour divertir les hommes par une fidèle représentation de la nature."¹ But "outre ce vrai général qui doit se trouver partout, il y a un vrai dans chacun des beaux arts et dans chaque science en particulier";² and "je trouve trois sortes de vrai dans la peinture: I. le vrai simple; II. le vrai idéal; III. le vrai composé, ou le vrai parfait."

I. "Le vrai simple est une imitation simple et fidèle des mouvements expressifs de la nature, et des objets tels que le peintre les a choisis pour modèle en sorte que les figures semblent, pour ainsi dire, pouvoir se détacher du tableau pour entrer en conversation avec ceux qui les regardent."

II. "Le vrai idéal est un choix de diverses perfections qui ne se trouvent jamais dans un seul modèle, mais qui se tirent de plusieurs et ordinairement de l'antique."³ Ce vrai idéal comprend l'abondance des pensées, la richesse des inventions, la convenance des attitudes, l'élégance des contours, le choix des belles expressions, le beau jet des draperies, enfin tout ce qui peut sans altérer le premier vrai le rendre plus piquant et plus convenable. Mais toutes ces perfections, ne pouvant subsister que dans l'idée par rapport à la peinture, ont besoin d'un sujet légitime qui les conserve et qui les fasse paraître avec avantage; et ce sujet légitime est le vrai simple."⁴ "Le vrai simple

¹ P. 29.² P. 30.³ "Ce second vrai, à parler dans la rigueur, est presque aussi réel que le premier; car il n'invente rien, mais il choisit partout" (p. 46).⁴ P. 32.

subsiste par lui-même, c'est l'assaisonnement des perfections qui l'accompagnent; c'est lui qui les fait goûter et qui les anime Il est constant que le vrai idéal tout seul mène par une voie très agréable; mais par laquelle le peintre ne pouvant arriver à la fin de son art, est contraint de demeurer en chemin, et l'unique secours qu'il doit attendre pour l'aider à remplir sa carrière doit venir du vrai simple. Il paraît donc que ces deux vrais, le vrai simple et le vrai idéal, font un composé parfait, dans lequel ils se prêtent un mutuel secours, avec cette particularité, que le premier vrai perce et se fait sentir au travers de toutes les perfections qui lui sont jointes.”¹

III. “ Le troisième vrai, qui est composé du vrai simple et du vrai idéal, fait par cette jonction le dernier achèvement de l'art, et la parfaite imitation de la belle nature. C'est ce beau vraisemblable qui paraît souvent plus vrai que la vérité même, parce que dans cette jonction le premier vrai saisit le spectateur, sauve plusieurs négligences, et se fait sentir le premier sans qu'on y pense. Ce troisième vrai est un but où personne n'a encore frappé; on peut dire seulement que ceux qui en ont le plus approché sont les plus habiles. Le vrai simple et le vrai idéal ont été partagés selon le génie et l'éducation des peintres qui les ont possédés. Géorgion, Titien, Pordenon, le vieux Palme, les Bassans, et toute l'école vénitienne n'ont point eu d'autre mérite que d'avoir possédé le premier vrai. Et Léonard de Vinci, Raphael, Jules Romain, Polidore de Caravage, le Poussin, et quelques autres de l'école romaine, ont établi leur plus grande réputation par le vrai idéal; mais surtout Raphael, qui outre les beautés du vrai idéal a possédé une partie considérable du vrai simple, et par

¹ Pp. 33 f.

ce moyen a plus approché du vrai parfait qu'aucun de sa nation." ¹

This exposition, though somewhat lacking in clearness, and not a little surprising in its classification of painters at the end, is sufficiently notable to have called for more attention than it seems to have received.² The single statement, "il y a un vrai dans chacun des beaux arts," running counter as it does to the whole trend of Batteux's book, *Les beaux arts réduits à un même principe*,³ contains in the germ the philosophy of Diderot's refutation of Batteux in the *Lettre sur les sourds et muets*;⁴ and de Piles's theory of the *vrai parfait* includes an important modification of Aristotle's definition, and Batteux's, according to which poet and painter are imitators of things as they ought to be. At the same time, it is a development of Boileau's all too rationalistic definition, "rien n'est beau que le vrai."⁵ De Piles reminds one of Daniello's mingling of fact and fiction;⁶ and he describes a kind of style that is rooted in actuality, however fantastically it may branch and blossom. For whether we regard de Piles's *vrai parfait* as the idealization of an individual model, or as the collocation and coalescence of ideal elements with the component elements of a model individual, the product is the same: the representation of the truth of nature, which to science is abstract, general, and ideal, and in art becomes concrete, particular, and real. Or, in de Piles's words, as he continues ⁷ to speak of Raphael, "En effet il paraît que pour imiter la nature dans sa variété, il se servait pour

¹ Pp. 34 f.

² Blümner gives it none.

³ Paris, 1747.

⁴ 1751. Cf. these *Publications*, vol. xxii, p. 630.

⁵ *Épître IX, au marquis de Seignelay*, l. 43. Quoted as a motto by Batteux on the frontispiece of *Les quatre poétiques*, Paris, 1771.

⁶ Cf. *supra*, p. 53.

⁷ Pp. 35 f.

l'ordinaire d'autant de naturels différents qu'il avait de différentes figures à représenter; et s'il ajoutait quelque chose du sien, c'était pour rendre les traits plus réguliers et plus expressifs, en conservant toujours le vrai et le caractère singulier de son modèle. Quoiqu'il n'ait pas entièrement connu le vrai simple dans les autres parties de la peinture, il avait cependant un tel goût pour le vrai en général que dans la plupart des parties du corps qu'il dessinait d'après nature il les exprimait sur son papier comme elles étaient effectivement, pour avoir des témoins de la vérité toute simple, et pour la joindre à l'idée qu'il s'était faite de la beauté de l'antique: conduite admirable qu'aucun autre peintre n'a tenue aussi heureusement que Raphael depuis le rétablissement de la peinture." For purposes of expression some painters have allowed themselves to exaggerate the forms of nature, and have developed a manner of treating details—called *charges*—which is not lacking in impressiveness. "Mais ceux qui ont une véritable idée de la correction de la simplicité régulière, et de l'élégance de la nature, traiteront de superflu ces charges qui altrèrent toujours la vérité";¹ and, finally, "les statues antiques, qui ont passé dans tous les temps pour la règle de la beauté, n'ont rien de chargé, ni rien d'affecté, non plus que les ouvrages de ceux qui les ont toujours suivis, comme Raphael, le Poussin, le Dominiquain, et quelques autres."² For de Piles, then, as for Winckelmann, Greek statues are models of beauty, and expressions of an ideal of nature in health; and the study of them is, if not the only, at least the shortest road to the perception of artistic truth. But for de Piles, as for du Fresnoy, Le Brun, and Boileau, it is reason that

¹ P. 37.² P. 39 f.

declares these statues to be models; and the ideas of beauty abstracted from them are to be used as guides in the selection of beauties from nature, or as elements to be combined with the elements of actual persons and things within the ken of the painter.

VI.

The "man of fine feeling" whom Lessing introduces to us at the beginning of *Laokoon* says of painting and poetry "beyde täuschen, und beyder Täuschung gefällt." "Täuschung," as August Schmarsow remarks,¹ "klingt uns derber als Illusion, entspricht aber der rationalistischen Denkart des 18. Jahrhunderts ebenso wie der nüchternen Ausdrucksweise des Alltags, aus dessen Durchschnitt sich der Mann mit feinem Gefühle zunächst heraushebt." Lessing himself, however, in spite of the example of Mendelssohn, hardly attained to a clearer conception of artistic illusion than that of de Piles.² De Piles says,³ "Les autres arts ne font que réveiller l'idée des choses absentes, au lieu que la peinture les supplée entièrement, et les rend présentes par son essence qui ne consiste pas seulement à plaire aux yeux, mais à les tromper." Our modern feeling revolts at the idea of deception, whether practised by Rembrandt with his portrait⁴ or attained in the perfect illusion of Zeuxis's grapes,⁵ or Myron's cow. Transcending for us all the fidelity to nature, and even much of the sensuous charm of a picture, is the human appeal of the

¹ *Erläuterungen und Kommentar zu Lessings Laokoon*, Leipzig, 1907, p. 79.

² Cf. Karl Lange, *Die ästhetische Illusion im 18. Jahrhundert* in the *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, I (1906), pp. 30-43.

³ P. 41.

⁴ *Supra*, p. 96, note 9.

⁵ P. 433.

artist expressing himself in his work. But this very expression is what de Piles, with Winckelmann, saw in works of art; and the capacity to make it is what de Piles sought to inculcate in artists; whereas Lessing, combating the "Wahrheit und Ausdruck" which modern painting seemed to have erected into its "erstes Gesetz,"¹ inevitably gave to that beauty which he declared to be the only thing represented by the ancient artist, and to be represented by the modern, a formalistic and unaffected expressionlessness into which only a rationalistic theorist could be betrayed.² De Piles must answer for the "akademische Auffassung der Kunst bis zur schrecklichsten Trockenheit fortgetrieben" which Justi not improperly attributes³ to some of the things that he did; but in insisting upon the conception of pictorial symbols as the means of artistic expression de Piles was right, and less "academic" than Lessing. Expression⁴ was not only,

¹ *Laokoon*, III, p. 164.

² *Ibid.*, II, p. 155; cf. *Nachlass A* (Blümner, p. 370): "Da Körper der eigentliche Vorwurf der Mahlerey sind, und der mahlerische Werth der Körper in ihrer Schönheit bestehet, so ist es offenbar, dass die Mahlerey ihre Körper nicht schön genug wählen kann." Mendelssohn protested in vain against this conclusion, saying (*ibid.*), "Dieser Schritt ist mir zu kühn. Die Schönheit der Formen macht vielleicht nicht den ganzen malerischen Werth der Körper aus, denn, wie es scheint, gehört die Rührung mit dazu." Chr. Schrempf has in his book *Lessing als Philosoph*, Stuttgart, 1906, some judicious pages (97-105) of the same tenor.

³ *Winckelmann*, I, p. 298.

⁴ "Le peintre qui a du génie trouve dans toutes les parties de son art une ample matière de le faire paraître; mais celle qui lui fournit plus d'occasions de faire voir ce qu'il a d'esprit, d'imagination, et de prudence, est sans doute l'invention. C'est par elle que la peinture marche à pas égal avec la poésie, et c'est elle principalement qui attire l'estime des personnes les plus estimables, je veux dire des gens d'esprit, qui non contents de la seule imitation des objets, veulent que le choix en soit juste pour l'expression du sujet" (p. 61). De Piles uses the word "expression" in its subjective and objective senses; i. e., (1) "ce que j'entends par le mot

along with composition, design, and coloring, one of de Piles's fixed standards for "academic" judgment, but also the source of a genuine enthusiasm, and the reason—or excuse—for an opinion, which Winckelmann also held, concerning a practice of painting that Lessing could not overthrow: the use of allegory.

One of the last chapters in the *Cours de peinture* is a *Dissertation, où l'on examine si la poésie est préférable à la peinture*.¹ Though given somewhat of an argumentative turn, this chapter is essentially a "parallel" between the arts, like Lionardo's, and Dryden's, and many others still to come; and, as might have been expected after the edition of du Fresnoy, de Piles, whenever he has in this treatise occasion to refer to poetry, does not fail to treat poetry as a sister art to painting. It is to be borne in mind, however, that de Piles, like du Fresnoy before him, nearly always means *dramatic* poetry when he says simply *poetry*. Thus, the sentence, "nos sens et la raison nous disent assez que la poésie ne fait entendre aucun événement que la peinture ne puisse faire voir"² would perhaps deserve Blümner's derision,³ if de Piles were not

d'expression n'est pas le caractère de chaque objet mais la pensée du cœur humain" (p. 491); and (2) "le mot d'expression se confond ordinairement en parlant de peinture avec celui de passion. Ils diffèrent néanmoins en ce que, expression est terme général qui signifie la représentation d'un objet selon le caractère de sa nature et selon le tour que le peintre a dessein de lui donner pour la convenance de son ouvrage. Et la passion en peinture est un mouvement du corps accompagné de certains traits sur le visage qui marquent une agitation de l'âme. Ainsi toute passion est une expression, mais toute expression n'est pas une passion. D'où l'on doit conclure qu'il n'y a point d'objet dans un tableau qui n'ait son expression" (p. 162).

¹ *Cours de peinture*, pp. 420–472.

² P. 18.

³ *Laokoon*, p. 36. As a matter of fact, Blümner ridicules a proposition that de Piles did not make at all; in referring to this passage, Blümner inverts it and translates: "Unsere Sinne und Vernunft sagen uns, heisst es, dass die Poesie jegliches Ereignis deutlich machen könnte, welches die Malerei ihrerseits sehen lassen könnte"—a very different story!

evidently thinking of the drama. The specification after the general statement in the following passage ¹ is further evidence of this identification: "pour les effets que la poésie et la peinture font sur les esprits, il est certain que l'une et l'autre sont capables de remuer puissamment les passions; et si les bonnes pièces de théâtre ont tiré et tirent encore tous les jours des larmes de leurs spectateurs, la peinture peut faire la même chose quand le sujet le demande, et qu'il est, comme nous le supposons, bien exprimé." Hence the propriety of saying ² concerning poetry and painting, "toutes deux conservent exactement l'unité de lieu, de temps, et de l'objet." De Piles demands poetic—let us say dramatic qualities in a picture; and if the means of pictorial art be the imitation or representation of bodies, its end is for him expression, even exposition and narration.

In the study referred to above,³ Fechner points out that however much authority Lessing's doctrine may have attained to in poetics, and however ready esthetic theorists may be to recognize its authority in the formative arts as well, painters and sculptors themselves have habitually disregarded it, and indeed have achieved some of their greatest successes in direct violation of Lessing's prohibitions. Examples of violent motion and emotion in sculpture, and of a naturalism which does not shun even the unclean and the ugly in painting are numerous and familiar. Strict logicians are not likely to abate one jot or tittle of Lessing's contention ⁴ "dass nur das die Bestimmung einer Kunst seyn kann, wozu sie einzig und allein geschickt ist, und nicht das, was andere Künste ebenso gut, wo nicht besser können, als sie"; and it re-

¹ P. 442.² P. 429.³ P. 42.⁴ *Laokoon*, *Nachlass D*, p. 460.

mains incontestable that the art which Lessing calls "Malerei" is that which solely and alone is eminently qualified to represent bodies. But the moment that we ask, for what purpose?—the moment that we consider the characteristics of the various arts that Lessing jumbled together, it appears that there is almost, if not quite, as much difference between sculpture and landscape, as between sculpture and poetry; and that, although in a monumental statue the artist's endeavor is undoubtedly to represent a body complete and beautiful in itself, the significance of a painting may consist in the relation in which bodies stand to one another, or in the atmosphere that gives them their appealing tone without perhaps allowing them to be seen distinctly enough to make possible the perception whether they are in themselves beautiful or not.¹ The objects that the painter imitates are always bodies; but for the purposes of his imitation depicted bodies are, more frequently than not, merely the means to expression; and the effect for which he strives is the impression made by his work as a whole—a psychological phenomenon which finds no explanation in the qualities of "bodies."² Fechner demonstrates that the Aristotelian subjects of esthetic imitation in general, viz., character, emotion, and action,³ are subjects for the formative arts; but with different degrees of appropriateness for the different arts. Thus, statuary is the supreme art for the representation of self-sufficient character—whether in the form of typical beauty or of

¹ Cf. Schmarsow, *op. cit.*, pp. 60, 69.

² Cf. Fechner, *l. c.*, p. 255.

³ *I. e.*, ἡδὴ, πᾶσι καὶ πράξεις; *Poetics*, I, 5; cf. the commentary in S. H. Butcher's edition, London, 1895, p. 116. Cf. also Hermann Baumgart, *Handbuch der Poetik*, Stuttgart, 1887, and the review by R. M. Werner in the *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, xv, 3, (4. Jul., 1889).

individualized personality; reliefs are eminently able to represent action,¹ as the Pergamenian marbles testify; and painting, with its resources of light, shade, and color, is qualified, as only music and poetry are besides, to suggest and stimulate emotion.

It has long since been observed² that Lessing, constrained by the fetters of "imitation," "illusion," "bodies," and "beauty," could not get away from the objective, formalistic, materialistic notion of "painting," and, concentrating his attention upon the most perfect representation of the human body in sculpture, saw nothing of the artistic possibilities of landscape painting,³ implicitly condemned the whole Dutch school of *genre*, practically expelled the painters of historical subjects from the temple of the arts, and failed altogether to provide for any other sort of beauty than that of isolated and unrelated human forms.⁴ "Schöne Körper in schönen Stellungen!"⁵

¹ The group of Laocoön and his sons is, in a sense, a specimen of high relief; it is designed to be viewed only from the front. Cf. Karl Sittl, *Empirische Studien über die Laokoongruppe*, Würzburg, 1895, p. 36.

² Cf. Schmarsow, *l. c.*, p. 48.

³ "Von den Landschaftsmählern; ob es ein Ideal in der Schönheit der Landschaften gebe. Wird verneinet. Daher der geringere Werth der Landschaftsmahler" (*Laokoon, Nachlass A*, p. 394).

⁴ Lessing inordinately restricts the painter's range of invention, saying (*Laokoon*, XI, p. 232), "Denn da er sahe, dass die Erfindung seine glänzende Seite nie werden könne, dass sein grösstes Lob von der Ausführung abhängt, so ward es ihm gleichviel, ob jene alt oder neu, einmal oder unzähligmal gebraucht sey, ob sie ihm oder einem anderen zugehöre. Er blieb in dem engen Bezirke weniger, ihm und dem Publico geläufig gewordener Vorwürfe, und liess seine ganze Erfindsamkeit auf die blosse Veränderung in dem Bekannten gehen, auf neue Zusammensetzungen alter Gegenstände. Das ist auch wirklich die Idee, welche die Lehrbücher der Mahlerey mit dem Worte Erfindung verbinden." Lessing refers to Hagedorn's *Betrachtungen über die Mahlerey* (1762); cf. Justi, *Winckelmann*, I, pp. 354 ff. It is manifest that Lessing was far from doing justice to the

⁵ *Laokoon*, XVI, p. 252.

Fechner exclaims,¹ "das langweiligste allegorische Gemälde, wofern es nur schöne Körper in schönen Stellungen in schöner Landschaft zeigt, wäre, ganz im Widerspruch mit Lessings Verbot, das Ideal der Malerei; man brauchte sich ja gar nicht um die Allegorie zu kümmern, sondern könnte im ästhetischen Genuss schwelgen. Eine Ausstellung von weiblichen Modellen oder eine Anzahl Nymphen und Göttinnen, von denen sich keine um die andere kümmert, würden allen Anforderungen Lessings an malerische Schönheit entsprechen." But painting, which is a representation of a chosen, limited portion of the world in the totality of its appearance to the artist's eye at a given time—even a portrait must have a background and a frame—gets its beauty from the qualities of the depicted scene as a whole, and its significance not from the illusory imitation of bodies, but from the suggestiveness of the expression which the artist is able to make by means of this more or less illusory imitation of bodies as symbols, and a more or less taking reproduction of the tone of the atmosphere which gives these bodies their sensuous charm.²

If Lessing's attempt to partition the field between the two sisters thus leads to a curtailment of the rights of one of them against which the artistic tradition from Lionardo

conception of invention in painting that prevailed among the French theorists. Whether he knew de Piles's *Cours de peinture* or not, I cannot say. A translation of this work under the title *Einleitung in die Malerey aus Grundsätzen* was printed at Leipzig in 1760; cf. *Antiquariats-Katalog* Nr. 86, *Die kleinen Klassiker*, Nr. 209, Friedrich Meyers Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1908. Hagedorn had great respect for de Piles.

¹ L. c., p. 255.

² In substantial agreement with Fechner, Schmarsow defines painting as "eigene, über die plastische Gestaltenbildung hinausgreifende Kunst, die eben nicht mehr die Einheit des organischen Körpers sondern die Einheit des Zusammenhangs zwischen den Körpern im Raum als ihre besondere Aufgabe erkennt" (p. 60).

to Winckelmann and the artistic practice from Polygnotus to Böcklin make eloquent protest, the question might well be asked whether it were not better to leave them as de Piles did in joint possession. De Piles gives to historical and landscape painting the first places among the varieties of pictorial art. He calls the former "le genre de peinture le plus considérable";¹ and though under the term "history" he includes a great variety of subjects, all belong to the realm of invention, and are expressions of that which the artist chooses to express. Fondness for historical subjects goes hand in hand with the dramatic character of painting; landscape² appeals to a more idyllic or epic mood. It too is a form of expression, and no copy of reality: "ainsi la peinture, qui est une espèce de création, l'est encore plus à l'égard du paysage."³ The very *imitation de la belle nature* which results in the *vrai parfait*,⁴ the emphasis upon subjective purpose implied in the consideration that the artist exercises choice, the constant admonition to the painter to correct the imperfections of nature, and the reiteration of the idea of the value of painting as a means of expression—all these things reveal to us in de Piles an enthusiast who looks upon the art from the opposite point of view to Lessing's, and enable us to understand how he could take the ground that Lessing spurned in respect to a means of expression that is not at all an imitation of nature, and that makes use of forms which, belonging originally to poetry, are nevertheless proper subjects for painting so soon as the imagination has bodied them forth. One may subscribe to everything that Lessing said about "Allegoristerei" and yet maintain that allegory has its place in paint-

¹ *Cours de peinture*, p. 53 ; cf. p. 389.

³ P. 201.

² P. 200.

⁴ P. 34 ; cf. *supra*, p. 98.

ing. One need not wince even at hearing that allegorical painting may easily degenerate into a system of incomprehensible hieroglyphics;¹ for as Diderot says,² every art has its hieroglyphs; and de Piles is nearer than Lessing to the truth that the "symbols" of painting are hardly more "natural" than the symbols of poetry.³ De Piles declares, to be sure, that words are but the names of things, whereas in painting, things themselves are presented to the eye;⁴ but on the other hand, he makes clearer than Lessing anywhere does that the figures of painting are something more than imitations of natural objects. The material colors used by the painter are the means of utterance for his thoughts: "ce qu'on veut appeler partie matérielle dans la peinture n'est autre chose que l'exécution de la partie spirituelle qu'on lui accorde, et qui est proprement l'effet de la pensée du peintre, comme la déclamation est l'effet de la pensée du poète."⁵ Provided, therefore, the purpose of expression is attained, allegorical figures are as legitimate as any that the brush can form.

De Piles defines allegory as follows: "l'invention allégorique est un choix d'objets qui servent à représenter dans un tableau, ou en tout, ou en partie, autre chose que ce qu'ils sont en effet";⁶ "l'allégorie est une espèce de langage qui doit être commun entre plusieurs personnes, et qui est fondé sur un usage reçu, et sur l'intelligence des livres de médailles";⁷ it is not the purpose of allegorical expression to convey its meaning with the unforce-

¹ Cf. du Bos, *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*, 3d ed., Paris, 1775, I, p. 203; and Lomazzo, *supra*, pp. 61 f.

² *Lettre sur les sourds et muets*.

³ Cf. R. Haym, *Herder*, Berlin, 1877, I, p. 247.

⁴ P. 471; cf. Lionardo, *supra*, p. 49.

⁵ P. 495.

⁶ P. 55.

⁷ P. 58.

ful self-evidence of literalness: "la trop grande facilité que l'on trouve à découvrir les choses affaiblit ordinairement les désirs; et les premiers philosophes ont cru qu'ils devaient envelopper la vérité sous des fables et sous des allégories ingénieuses, afin que leur science fût recherchée avec plus de curiosité, ou qu'en tenant les esprits appliqués elle jetât des racines plus profondes: car les choses font d'autant plus d'impression dans notre esprit et dans notre mémoire qu'elles exercent plus agréablement notre attention. Jésus-Christ même s'est servi de cette façon d'instruire, afin que les comparaisons et les paraboles tinssent ses auditeurs plus attentifs aux vérités qu'elles signifiaient"; ¹ in painting there are allegories "dont nous nous faisons un plaisir de trouver le sens, ou d'en critiquer l'obscurité"; ² there are paintings that are entirely allegorical; but "les ouvrages dont les objets ne sont allégoriques qu'en partie attirent plus facilement et plus agréablement notre attention, parce que le spectateur qui est aidé par le mélange des figures purement historiques démêle avec plaisir les allégories qui les accompagnent." ³ The process called *démêler* must, however, not be one of insuperable difficulty, and all allegory must have three qualities: it must be intelligible; ⁴ it must be authorized; ⁵ and it must be necessary: "car tant que l'histoire se peut éclaircir par des objets simples qui lui appartiennent, il est inutile de chercher des secours étrangers qui l'ornent bien moins qu'ils ne l'embarrassent." ⁶

"Bezüglich der Allegorie," says Blümner, ⁷ "ist de

¹ P. 461; cf. Dolce, p. 242, *supra*, p. 58.

² P. 4.

³ P. 57.

⁴ P. 71.

⁵ "L'autorité la mieux reçue pour les allégories est celle de l'antiquité, parce qu'elle est incontestable" (p. 71).

⁶ P. 72.

⁷ *Laokoon*, p. 37.

Piles völlig blind." It might be nearer the truth to call him clairvoyant; for he proves himself able to pierce the shrouds of many a mystery that baffles ordinary eyes; or inconsistent; for, although he defines painting as an art "qui sur une superficie plate imite tous les objets visibles,"¹ "en sorte qu'il [le peintre] est obligé non seulement de plaire aux yeux, mais encore de les tromper en tout ce qu'il représente,"² he is willing in the interest of allegory to divest the visible symbol not only of its individual reality, but even of its visibility: "Et si le peintre, dans la vue de s'exprimer avec plus d'élégance, juge à propos de représenter les divinités de la fable parmi les figures historiques, il faut considérer ces symboles comme invisibles, et comme n'y étant que par leur signification allégorique."³ This is certainly not a happy expression. To speak ill of the bridge that has brought you safely over is bad enough; to deny its existence is madness. But de Piles's mind is so intent upon the *meaning* of allegorical figures that he can disregard their appearance. He is thinking of subjective expression and impression.

If poetry and painting are alike, the purposes of poet and painter cannot be radically different. In an interesting discussion of the function of poetry, Spingarn⁴ shows how successive writers manipulated the Horatian "prodesse" and "delectare," and remarks that "Minturno (1559) added a third element to that of instruction and delight. The function of poetry is not only to teach and delight but also to move, that is, beyond instruction and delight the poet must impel certain passions in the reader or hearer, and incite the mind to admiration of what is described." This third element was, from Alberti

¹ P. 313.

² *Vie des peintres*, p. 59.

³ P. 317.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 47-59.

on, one of the most prominent in the esthetics of the painters, and is above all conspicuous in the *Aretino* of Dolce (1557). It is no less conspicuous in de Piles. De Piles holds that the function of both poetry and painting is to *instruire* and *plaire*; but "il est certain que l'une et l'autre sont capables de remuer puissamment les passions";¹ and "la véritable peinture est donc celle qui nous appelle (pour ainsi dire) en nous surprenant; et ce n'est que par la force de l'effet qu'elle produit que nous ne pouvons nous empêcher d'en approcher, comme si elle avait quelque chose à nous dire";² "je conclus que la véritable peinture doit appeler son spectateur par la force et par la grande vérité de son imitation; et que le spectateur surpris doit aller à elle comme pour entrer en conversation avec les figures qu'elle représente."³ || Conversation, however, is an intellectual exercise; and, like the true friend of Boileau that he was, de Piles demands that painting shall be put upon a parity with poetry because it gives, equally with poetry, an opportunity to exercise the reason. Painting no less than poetry is an expression of thought; and its symbols, like those of poetry, call for intelligent interpretation, and give pleasure both through the perception of what they are and through the understanding of what they mean. "Si par le mot de raisonnement on entend l'action de l'entendement qui infère une chose par la connaissance d'une autre, il se trouve également dans la poésie et dans la peinture"⁴—a proposition which de Piles thereupon demonstrates by an interpretation of Rubens's picture of the birth of Louis XIII, then in the Luxembourg gallery, now in the Louvre.

Few painters have made bolder use of allegory than

¹ P. 442.

³ P. 6; cf. Chambray, *supra*, p. 69.

² P. 4.

⁴ Pp. 462 f.

Rubens, and the series of pictures in which he glorified the life of Marie de Médicis falls little short of audacity. In these, if anywhere, allegory has accepted its greatest hazard. Here, if anywhere, reason must come to the aid of the senses, or all esthetic pleasure may vanish in bewilderment, and the spectator will say with Blümner that allegorical and historical personages are mingled "in einer aller Vernunft hohnsprechenden Art."¹ The cool and clear-headed Abbé du Bos took this ground, perhaps in conscious opposition to de Piles. Du Bos was willing that old established allegories should be represented by conventional figures which have acquired, so to speak, the rights of citizenship among human beings. But "leurs cadets, qui depuis une centaine d'années sont sortis du cerveau des peintres, sont des inconnus et des gens sans aveu, qui ne méritent pas qu'on en fasse aucune mention. Ils sont des chiffres dont personne n'a la clef, et même peu de gens la cherchent."² Du Bos is especially impatient with the mingling of allegorical and natural personages in one and the same scene, since it destroys all illusion and takes away all verisimilitude; and he condemns these compositions as defeating the very end of painting. Of the picture on which de Piles employs his interpretative sagacity du Bos says,³ "Je suis encore persuadé que le magnifique tableau qui représente l'accouchement de Marie de Médicis, plairait davantage si Rubens, au lieu du génie et des autres figures allégoriques qui entrent dans l'action du tableau, y avait fait paraître celles des femmes de ce temps-la qui pouvaient assister aux couches de la reine. On le regarderait avec plus de satisfaction, si Rubens avait exercé sa poésie à représenter les unes contentes, les

¹ *Laokoon*, p. 18.² *Réflexions critiques*, I, p. 194.³ P. 197.

autres transportées de joie, quelques-unes sensibles aux douleurs de la reine, et d'autres un peu mortifiées de voir un dauphin en France. Les peintres sont poètes, mais leur poésie ne consiste pas tant à inventer des chimères ou des jeux d'esprit, qu'à bien imaginer quelles passions et quels sentiments l'on doit donner aux personnages, suivant leur caractère et la situation où l'on les suppose, comme à trouver les expressions propres à rendre ces passions sensibles, et à faire deviner ces sentiments." There is no denying the reasonableness of these propositions, which Blümner quotes with approval; and the conclusion that du Bos reaches after several pages of further argumentation is sound, if one accepts the premises. The conclusion is,¹ "les tableaux ne doivent pas être des énigmes, et le but de la peinture n'est pas d'exercer notre imagination, en lui donnant des sujets embrouillés à deviner. Son but est de nous émouvoir, et par conséquent les sujets de ses ouvrages ne sauraient être trop faciles à entendre." This is the very reverse of de Piles's doctrine. How is it with the premises from which du Bos deduced this conclusion, and what would be the effect of the conclusion as a precept? What did Rubens seek to express in this series of pictures? Clearly, it was not beyond his power to do with the literalness of history all that du Bos wished him to have done. But he tried to give an interpretation of the meaning of history in figurative form. Into bodies whose very unnaturalness connects them with the world of the spirit he breathed the animation of that poetry which Varchi and Armenini called the soul of things; "fleshiness" itself in these figures serves to spiritualize each picture taken as a whole; and the picture as a whole reveals, or is intended to reveal,

¹ P. 212.

the divinity that doth hedge a king. The most eloquent of Rubens's admirers in our own time thus elucidates the artist's motives:¹ "In den Geschichten der Maria von Medici führt er die Gottheiten und allegorischen Personen als die eigentlich treibenden Kräfte mitten unter den Menschenkindern seiner Tage vor, und erreicht so eine Historiographie nach den Anschauungen der Gesellschaft, für die er schafft, wie sie bei einer Trennung beider Klassen von Wesen gar nicht möglich gewesen wäre. Die ganze Erklärung bevorzugter Menschenschicksale, deren Bahnen in den Sternen geschrieben stehen und dort von der Hand der Vorsehung vorgezeichnet sind, findet in diesem Gemäldezyklus ihren Ausdruck, wie Schiller sie seinem Wallenstein in den Mund zu legen versucht." And the sensible Sir Joshua Reynolds reminds us of two other points of view from which to judge these and similar allegorical paintings. In his seventh *Discourse*² Reynolds says of Rubens, "if the artist considered himself as engaged to furnish this gallery with a rich, various, and splendid ornament, this could not be done, at least in an equal

¹ Schmarsow, *l. c.*, p. 73.

² Cf. E. G. Johnson, *Sir Joshua Reynolds's Discourses*, Chicago, 1891, p. 187. Reynolds's *Discourses*, which he delivered as President of the Royal Academy between the years 1769 and 1790 are among the best expositions in English of the art of painting in its more general bearings. Reynolds speaks, like Corneille, in his discourses on the drama, with the authority and modesty of knowledge and successful experience. Towards the literature of the subject that we have discussed his attitude is critical, especially towards that part of it which emphasizes genius, or any other irrational element. He does not belong, therefore, in the category of those whose theories are developments of a tradition based upon subserviency to authority; but is, like his friend Burke, whose treatise on the Sublime he esteemed so highly, an independent, empirical philosopher. He even denies that painting is an art of imitation. Although he did not begin his discourses until three years after the publication of *Laokoon* (1766), he seems to have had no knowledge of Lessing's work. ??

degree, without peopling the air and water with these allegorical figures; he therefore accomplished all that he purposed." And secondly, "what has been so often said to the disadvantage of allegorical poetry—that it is tedious and uninteresting—cannot with the same propriety be applied to painting, where the interest is of a different kind. If allegorical painting produces a greater variety of ideal beauty, a richer, a more various and delightful composition, and gives to the artist a greater opportunity of exhibiting his skill, all the interest he wishes for is accomplished; such a picture not only attracts but fixes the attention."

It is of less immediate moment for us to seek an agreement upon the sanctions of allegory¹ than to understand the kind of painting that de Piles and his compeers equated with poetry. For de Piles, painting was so far from being an imitation of bodies that it tended to become even incorporeal; and when he said "*Ut pictura poesis*" he was as far as possible from advocating a frosty versified description of external nature. His "parallel"² is indeed more traditional than original. He makes little attempt to distinguish between the arts: painting and poetry differ, he says, only in practice and execution;³ but his idea that pictorial execution is more difficult than poetic execution⁴ is also Lessing's in *Laokoon*;⁵ he has the ideas of succession and coexistence as clearly in mind⁶ as Lessing has; and, as it were in spite of himself, he admits a certain difference in

¹ Cf. H. Blümner, *Laokoon-Studien*, I, Freiburg, 1881; reviewed by Veit Valentin in the *Beiblatt zur Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, Nr. 37, June 8, 1882; V. Valentin, *Kunst, Symbolik und Allegorie*, in the *Zeitschrift* aforesaid, XVIII (1883), pp. 120 ff., 145 ff.; Schmarsow's books referred to l. c., p. 115; and Volkelt, l. c., p. 405.

² *Cours de peinture*, pp. 420–472.

³ P. 444.

⁴ P. 422 f.

⁵ XI, p. 231.

⁶ P. 449.

the kind of subjects appropriate for poetry and painting: ¹ "la principale fin du poète est d'imiter les mœurs et les actions des hommes: la peinture a le même objet; mais elle y va d'une manière bien plus étendue; car on ne peut nier qu'elle n'imité Dieu dans sa toute-puissance: c'est à dire, dans la création des choses visibles." And on the other hand,² "Je sais bien que l'on peut attribuer à la parole des expressions que la peinture ne peut suppléer qu'imparfaitement: mais je sais bien aussi que la poésie est fort éloignée d'exprimer avec autant de vérité et d'exactitude que la peinture tout ce qui tombe sous le sens de la vue. Quelque description que la poésie nous fasse d'un pays, quelque soin qu'elle prenne à nous représenter la physionomie, les traits, et la couleur d'un visage, ces portraits laisseront toujours de l'obscurité et de l'incertitude dans l'esprit et n'approcheront jamais de ceux que la peinture nous expose." This is an unmistakable warning against "die Schilderungssucht in der Poesie."³

VII.

Dryden's *Parallel of Poetry and Painting* is described by Ker⁴ as "in the main a statement of the case for idealism in art, with the implication that the true following of nature in art is to discover the ideal and to neglect the distractions of the manifold particulars of experience." After a few prefatory words concerning himself, Dryden begins with a fairly full summary of Bellori's "Idea of

¹ P. 452.² Pp. 468 f.³ Blümner can hardly have had these sentences in mind when he wrote of de Piles's "parallel" between the arts: "Hier ist freilich von Einsicht in ihr gegenseitiges Verhältniß keine Rede" (*Laokoon*, p. 36).⁴ *L. c.*, I, p. lxviii.

a painter," and then proceeds with what is practically a running commentary upon du Fresnoy's poem, showing how the rules of one art find application in the practice of the other. The most significant of his remarks are particular applications of these rules—including confessions about his own works;—and on the general theory of either poetry or painting he has little to add to the traditional doctrine. It is noteworthy, however, that he departs from du Fresnoy's assimilation of painting to dramatic poetry, and finds room for other expressions in painting than those of nature idealized. Thus, the ideal of perfect humanity seems to him to belong only to the characters in epic poetry;¹ so that the painter's representations of the ideal stand closer to the epic than to the drama. For "the perfection of . . . stage-characters consists chiefly in their likeness to the deficient faulty nature, which is their original";² and "this idea of perfection is of little use in portraits."³ But like the writer of tragedies, comedies, and farces, the painter may represent persons and scenes that are more or less noble, or even grotesque and merely amusing.⁴ "The principal end of painting is to please, and the chief design of poetry is to instruct. In this the latter seems to have the advantage of the former; but if we consider the artists themselves on both sides, certainly their aims are the very same; they would both make sure of pleasing, and that in preference to instruction."⁵ As to ideal imitation, Dryden holds, with

¹ "There is scarce a frailty to be left in the best of them, any more than is to be found in the divine nature" (Ker, II, p. 271). Dryden was then working on his translation of Virgil.

² P. 125.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ P. 132.

⁵ P. 128.

Boileau and others, that the esthetic pleasure which it gives is due to its being a representation of the higher truth of nature.¹

VIII.

Among the many writers on painting and poetry in the eighteenth century, two, du Bos and Batteux, expressly committed themselves to faith in the nostrum *Ut pictura poesis*. But since I have elsewhere² briefly animadverted to them, and their importance has been adequately set forth by Blümner³ and others, I shall pass over them and not a few other theorists who might be examined in connection with this subject; and shall bring my study to a close with the consideration of a man who stands in particularly intimate relation to de Piles, the painter Antoine Coypel. His *Discours prononcés dans les conférences de l'Académie royale de Peinture et de Sculpture*,⁴ though known to Lessing,⁵ have been disregarded by Blümner.

Coypel was not only a devoted friend of Roger de Piles,⁶ but also an ardent admirer of Boileau. He relates⁷ how Boileau encouraged him to publish the poem *L'esthétique du peintre* which, long before, he had composed in the form of an epistle to his son,⁸ and to write the series of dissertations on various texts from it which he read before

¹ Cf. p. 137.

² Cf. these *Publications*, vol. xxii, pp. 621-630.

³ *Laokoon*, pp. 39-45.

⁴ Paris, 1721; cf. Jouin, pp. 215-368.

⁵ *Laokoon*, *Nachlass D*, p. 469.

⁶ Coypel designed the frontispiece to de Piles's *Abrégé de la vie des peintres*.

⁷ Jouin, p. 367.

⁸ Charles Antoine, known both as a painter and as a dramatist; cf. Lessing's *Theatralische Bibliothek*, 4. Stück, 1758.

the Académie de Peinture and subsequently, as we have said, published in 1721. The first discourse¹ in this volume was designed as a preface, and is a rhapsody on "l'excellence de la peinture." It contains little that is new or remarkable, but may fairly be taken as a corroboration of de Piles.² When, therefore, Coypel protests that by the word painter he means creative artist and not artisan in colors; that painting as well as eloquence is qualified to treat subjects from the realm of the mind or the heart; that "elle sait par les allégories donner à des choses invisibles des images corporelles qui les font voir au même temps aux yeux et à l'esprit";³ that "il est vrai que la peinture et la poésie sont deux sœurs, et que ce qui convient à l'une convient également à l'autre; même enthousiasme, même génie, mêmes principes";⁴ and that in both poetry and painting there is produced a "concert parfait qui enchante les yeux, l'esprit, l'imagination et le cœur"⁵—we may rest assured that painting so understood was an art of expression and not one of mere representation; and that it was so understood by de Piles and by Boileau.

For if Coypel differs at all from de Piles, it is in the direction of greater likeness to Boileau. *L'esthétique du peintre* quotes from Boileau, just as *De arte graphica* quotes from Horace; it puts a little more stress than is put by either du Fresnoy or de Piles upon reason; it restates de Piles's idea of *le vrai parfait*:

✓ "Le dessin élégant de l'antique sculpture,
Joint aux effets naïfs que fournit la nature"⁶—

¹ Read to the Academy Dec. 7, 1720; Jouin, pp. 215-229.

² "J'étais toujours le confident de ses ouvrages à mesure qu'il les produisait. Cette confiance, autant utile qu'agréable pour moi, m'engagea à quelque retour" (Jouin, p. 367).

³ P. 219.

⁴ P. 219.

⁵ P. 220.

⁶ Ll. 89, 90.

but its supreme commandment is (ll. 175 f.) :

“Puissez dans le vrai seul le solide et le beau, /
Que la raison partout guide votre peinceau.”

The comments which in the form of *discours* follow the *épître* confirm the impression given by the verses, that Coypel sought to be for the painter what Boileau had been for the poet, a rationalizing legislator. Boileau is “l’Horace de nos jours”;¹ “et c’est la raison même qui parle par sa bouche.”² “En effet, ne voyons-nous pas tous les jours que les mêmes traits qui ont le plus frappé les hommes dans les ouvrages des modernes sont ceux mêmes qui ont fait admirer les chefs-d’œuvres des grands maîtres de l’antiquité? Car le bon sens et la raison sont de tous les siècles et de tous les temps, et la vérité ne doit être qu’une.”³ Coypel, then, entered into full possession of Boileau’s “highest contribution to the literary criticism of the neo-classical period”;⁴ and when he says,⁵ “le grand peintre doit être poète,” and shows how in the six elements, “un événement convenable et important, . . . la fable, les mœurs, la direction, la décoration, et la musique,”⁶ a heroic picture is like a tragedy, we cannot suppose him carried away by any visionary enthusiasm, but must credit him with sober earnest in the identification that du Fresnoy and de Piles also made of painting and the drama.

IX.

The *Vorrede* to Lessing’s *Laokoon* contains in condensed form a number of ideas more fully elaborated in one of the preliminary sketches preserved as *Nachlass A*.⁷ Les-

¹ P. 305.

² P. 270.

³ P. 303.

⁴ Spingarn; cf. *supra*, p. 78.

⁵ P. 277.

⁶ P. 239.

⁷ Blümner, pp. 357 f.

sing speaks here of the tendency to *Schilderungssucht* and *Allegoristerei* which has resulted from imperfect demarcation of the fields of painting and poetry, and continues, "Ausser diesen Verleitungen der Dichter und Künstler selbst, haben die seichten Parallelen der Poesie und Mahlerey auch den Criticus öfters zu ungegründeten Urtheilen verführet, wenn er in den Werken des Dichters und Mahlers über einerley Vorwurf, die darinn bemerkten Abweichungen von einander zu Fehlern machen wollen, die er dem einen oder dem andern, nachdem er entweder mehr Geschmack an der Dichtkunst oder Mahlerey hat, zur Last geleet. Und diesen ungegründeten Urtheilen wenigstens abzuhelpen, dürfte es sich wohl der Mühe verlohnen, die Medaille auch einmal umzukehren, und die Verschiedenheit zu erwägen, die sich zwischen der Dichtkunst und Mahlerey findet, um zu sehen, ob aus dieser Verschiedenheit nicht Gesetze folgen, die der einen und der andern eigenthümlich sind, und die eine öfters nöthigen, einen ganz andern Weg zu betreten, als ihre Schwester betritt, wenn sie wirklich den Titel einer Schwester behaupten, und nicht in eine eyfersüchtige nachäffende Nebenbuhlerin ausarten will." There can be no doubt that it was high time, in Germany at any rate, to distinguish, instead of comparing, or seeking reasons for preferring one art to the other. Nor can there be any question that many of the "parallels" were indeed shallow. But not every one, and not any in all respects. The very worst does not mean by its *Ut pictura poesis* to encourage the poet to a lifeless enumeration of the parts of bodies, or to any other inexpressive copying of reality. In saying *Ut pictura poesis* most of them mean *Ut poesis pictura*; and the kind of painting so likened to poetry is no inappropriate illustration of a poetic process. Among the artists and theo-

rists whose works we have examined there was hardly one who did not know more about poetry than Lessing knew about painting. We get from *Laokoon* and from Blümler's historical introduction an ex-parte presentation of their case by opponents of their doctrine. Letting the painters speak for themselves, we acquire increased respect for their intentions, and many times a new opinion of their insight, whatever we may think of the pictures that they produced or praised. We get, furthermore, a better conception of *Laokoon* as the descendant of a long and not ignoble ancestry; and our admiration for Lessing and his critical method¹ rises to the pitch of our esteem for those whom he opposed, and who, without method, were often unable to formulate, as he formulated, practical rules of immediate applicability to practical problems. The poet and the painter alike could not but profit by the caution that Lessing gave them concerning the limits of their respective arts. If these limits were too narrow, the limits drawn by Lessing's predecessors were generally too wide. A reconsideration of the whole matter ought, finally, to induce in us a catholic spirit towards questions which are many-sided and difficult, and which the unaided reason is perhaps not competent to settle.

WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD.

¹ Cf. W. Wundt, *Lessing und die kritische Methode*, in *Essays*,² Leipzig, 1906, pp. 417-440; and W. Dilthey, *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung*, Leipzig, 1906, pp. 22-42.

IV.—CHAUCER'S LEGEND OF MEDEA.

I.

In the Prologue to the *Man of Law's Tale* we are told that any one who will read Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women* may see—

The crueltee of thee, queen Medea,
Thy litel children hanging by the hals
For thy Jason, that was of love so fals;

but when one turns to the *Legend of Medea*, one looks in vain for the promised bit of sensationalism. In the closely related *Legend of Hypsipyle*, to be sure, the unhappy Lemnian queen prophetically prays—

That she, that had his herte yrafte her fro,
Moste finden him to her untrewes also,
And that she moste bothe her children spille.¹

In the *Legend of Medea*, however, Medea's slaughter of her children is not even hinted at. There the story of her fortunes is concluded with the lines:

For as a traitour he is from her go,
And with her lafte his yonge children two,
And falsly hath betrayed her, alas!
And ever in love a cheef traitour he was;
And wedded yit the thridde wyf anon,
That was the doghter of the king Creon. (1656-1661.)

¹ L. G. W., 1572-4. Chaucer's lines are based on Ovid's Epistle of Hypsipyle, *Heroides*, 6, 159-160:

Quam fratri germana fuit miseroque parenti
Filia, tam natis, tam sit acerba viro.

All the cruelty of Queen Medea is suppressed. Not only is Chaucer silent as to the murder of her children; he breathes no hint of her vengeance on her rival, 'the doghter of the king Creon'; nor does he touch on the earlier episode of her barbarous murder of Absyrtus. It is not the cruelty of Medea, but her kindness, which is emphasized:

This is the meed of loving and guerdoun
That Medea received of Jasoun
Right for her trouthe and for her kindenesse,
That loved him better than herself, I gesse. (1662-1665.)

Whatever knowledge Chaucer may have had of Medea's story, it is clear that when he wrote his *Legend* he made her conform to the type of noble womanhood ill-entreated, represented by his other heroines. It was essential to the unity of his plan that Jason and not Medea should be presented as cruel and unnatural.

For so striking a disparity between the *Legend of Medea* and the Man of Law's allusion to it one is driven to seek an explanation. The only explanation hitherto suggested, so far as I know,¹ was offered many years ago by Professor Lounsbury.² 'It would be in full consonance,' he says, 'with all the known facts to assume that when Chaucer wrote the prologue to the Man of Law's tale he had not written the account of Medea which has come down to us; and that when it was written it came to be something different from what he had purposed to make it originally. The most that can be claimed for this explanation is that it is possibly true, and not improbable in itself. Still, it has nothing in its favor that can strictly be called evi-

¹The disparity is briefly noticed by Bech, *Anglia*, 5, 374-5.

²*Studies in Chaucer*, 1, 418.

dence.' To this suggestion Professor Tatlock, in his admirable work on *The Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*,¹ refers in a footnote as a 'hint which can hardly be taken up.' When the present writer began to interest himself in this question, he had forgotten that Professor Lounsbury had noticed it. If he persists in taking up the hint, it is because he believes that he has something to advance in its favor which may fairly be called evidence.

The Man of Law's reference to the story of Medea not only misrepresents Chaucer's handling of the theme in his *Legend*, but in an important detail is at variance with classical tradition as well. That Medea, in a passion of jealous rage at Jason's desertion of her for another bride, slew the two sons whom she had borne to him, Chaucer might have learned from a number of sources easily accessible to him; but in the choice of 'hanging by the hals' as the particular means of their murder, he has cut loose from tradition.² In Euripides³ and in Seneca⁴ Medea slays her children with a sword. Ovid specifically says: 'Sanguine natorum perfunditur impius ensis.'⁵ More definitely yet, Diodorus says that she cut the throats of her sons.⁶ Medea is commonly represented in ancient art

¹ London, Chaucer Society, 1907, p. 175. Since this article was written, the hint has been taken up by Miss E. P. Hammond in her *Chaucer, A Bibliographical Manual*, New York, 1908, p. 252. She advances no evidence in its favor, but seems ready to accept it on Lounsbury's authority.

² This discrepancy Lounsbury failed to notice. Bech was aware of it, apparently, though he makes nothing of it: 'Die auch sonst ungenaue angabe gemacht wird: Thy litel children hanging by the hals.' *Anglia*, 5, 375.

³ *Medea*, 1278.

⁴ *Medea*, 1006.

⁵ *Metamorphoses*, 7, 396.

⁶ *Ἀποσφάξαι*, *Bibliotheca Historica*, 4, 54, 7.

grasping an unsheathed sword.¹ In Apollodorus² and Hyginus³ the manner of death is not specified. The former is content with the general term *ἀπέκτεινε* and the latter with *interfecit*. I have been able to find in classical authors no suggestion of any death for Medea's children other than that by the sword.

But Chaucer's acquaintance with classic myth was in many cases derived at second hand, from medieval rather than ancient sources. Among these sources the *Roman de la Rose* plays an important part, and here we find a version of Medea's crime which approaches somewhat nearer to that suggested by the Man of Law. At the conclusion of an epitome of Jason's story which fills 34 lines Jean de Meun says of Medea:

Dont ses enfans, quant el le sot,
 Por ce que de Jason les ot,
Estrangla de duel et de rage,
 Dont el ne fist mie que sage,
 Quant el lessa pitié de mère
 Et fist pis que marastre amère.⁴

If strangling is not the same as 'hanging by the hals,' it is at least nearly related. Moreover, the 'crueltee' of Medea, the trait so conspicuously absent from Chaucer's *Legend*, is sufficiently emphasized here. In the line: 'Por ce que de Jason les ot,' one is tempted to see the suggestion of the Man of Law's '*For thy Jason that was of love so fals.*' Chaucer's familiarity with the *Roman de la Rose*, as shown by his repeated borrowings from it, was

¹ Baumeister, *Denkmäler des klassischen Altertums*, 1887, 2, 874-5, 902-8.

² *Bibliotheca*, 1, 9, 28.

³ *Fabulae*, 25.

⁴ *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel, 14198-14203.

minute and thorough. In view of these facts it looks as though the Man of Law's allusion to Medea, which purports to refer to Chaucer's *Legend of Medea*, is in reality indebted to the *Roman de la Rose*.¹ This probability I shall try to strengthen by further considerations.

To do this it will be necessary to see the extent of Chaucer's acquaintance with the myth of Medea and Jason, and the sources from which this acquaintance was drawn. Apart from the *Legend of Good Women* itself and from the Man of Law's allusion to it, I find in Chaucer's works six references to the story, of which five are in poems written earlier than the Prologue to the *Legend*. Two of these are mere mentions of Medea as a sorceress, and in each of these cases her name is coupled with that of Circe. In the *House of Fame* among the 'magiciens and tregetours' who throng the palace of Fame,

Ther saugh I thee, queen Medea,
And Circes eke, and Calipsa;
Ther saugh I Hermes Ballenus,
Lymote, and eek Simon Magus. (3, 181-4.)

In the *Knight's Tale*, in describing the temple of Venus, Chaucer says:

For soothly, al the mount of Citheroun,
Ther Venus hath hir principal dwelling,
Was shewed on the wal in portreying,
With al the gardin, and the lustinesse.
Nat was foryeten the porter Ydelnesse,
Ne Narcisus the faire of yore agon,
Ne yet the folye of king Salamon,
Ne yet the grete strengthe of Hercules—

¹ It would be interesting to know whence Jean de Meun's *estrangla* is derived. This I have not been able to determine.

Th' enchaunements of Medea and Circes—
 Ne of Turnus, with the hardy fiers corage,
 The riche Cresus, caytif in servage. (A 1936-1946.)

The moral is drawn that neither wisdom, nor riches, nor sleight, nor strength, nor hardiness can hold equality with love; for all these persons were caught in love's snare till they cried 'alas!'. This passage, for which there is no parallel in the *Teseide*, is in its *dramatis personæ* strongly suggestive of the *Roman de la Rose*. The coupling of the names of Medea and Circe here and in the lines just quoted from the *House of Fame* seems to point to a particular passage in the *Roman*. As an example of the folly of trusting in sorcery and necromancy, Jean de Meun reminds us that—

Onques ne pot tenir Médée
 Jason por nul enchantement;
 N'onc Circé ne tint ensement
 Ulixes qu'il ne s'enfoïst,
 Por nul sort que faire poïst. (15350-4.)

The enchantments of Medea and Circe in the passage from the *Knight's Tale* could not save them from the snare of love; here their enchantments were not strong enough to hold their lovers faithful. As a further link between this passage and that quoted from the *House of Fame* we may notice that Jean de Meun mentions 'Balenus ne sa science' only four lines above the passage just cited. This 'Balenus,' as Skeat has pointed out,¹ is identical with the 'Hermes Ballenus' of Chaucer.

Still another Medea allusion in the *House of Fame* may be attributed, for its suggestion at any rate, to the *Roman de la Rose*. After the long account of Dido at

¹ Oxford Chaucer, 3, 272.

the beginning of the poem, Chaucer tells in nine lines the story of Phyllis and Demophon, and then goes on—

Eek lo! how fals and reccheles
Was to Briseida Achilles,
And Paris to Oenone;
And Jason to Isiphile;
And eft Jason to Medea;
And Ereules to Dyanira;
For he lefte hir for Iole,
That made him cacche his deeth, pardee. (1, 397-404.)

Immediately after this the story of Theseus and Ariadne is recounted in twenty-two lines. One of the sections into which the *Roman de la Rose* is divided¹ opens with the story of Dido in thirty-seven lines, which is followed successively by the story of Phyllis in four lines, of C  none in fourteen lines, and of Medea in thirty-four lines,² all told to illustrate the perjury of lovers. Too much must not be made of the identical order of the two lists, because for that Ovid is in part responsible. But in the *Heroides* Dido's epistle is number seven, and later than the epistles of Phyllis (II), Briseis (III), and C  none (V), whereas the Carthaginian queen heads the list both in Chaucer and in Jean de Meun. It seems fair to assume that when Chaucer had completed his long account of Dido, he added the passage we are considering, with its further instances of lovers' perjuries, because Jean de Meun's similar procedure came to his mind. This assumption is strengthened by a clear case of verbal borrowing. Chaucer's synopsis of the story of Demophon and Phyllis runs as follows:

¹ Beginning at line 14115.

² It is in this passage that we find the account of Medea strangling her children, already quoted.

Lo, Demophon, duk of Athenis,
 How he forswor him ful falsly
 And trayed Phillis wikkedly,
 The kinges doghter was of Trace,
 And falsly gan his *terme pace*;
 And when she wiste that he was fals
 She heng hirself right by the hals. (*H. F.*, 1, 388-394.)

Jean de Meun says:

Phillis ausinc tant atendi
 Demophon, qu'ele se pendi
 Por le *terme* qu'il *trespassa*,
 Dont serement et foi cassa. (14152-5.)

Apart from the general similarity of the two passages, the likeness between Chaucer's 'gan his *terme pace*' and the French 'Por le *terme* qu'il *trespassa*' is too striking to be an accident.¹ Ovid merely says:² 'Ultra promissum tempus abesse.'

There is another allusion to the story of Phyllis in the *Book of the Duchess*, lines 728-731, in which Demophon is said to have 'broke his *terme-day*.' Though the similarity of phrase is less striking than that which we have just noticed, it is sufficiently conclusive in a poem so saturated with the *Roman de la Rose* as is the *Book of the Duchess*. And here again in closest conjunction with Phyllis we find Queen Dido (line 732) and Medea. The mysterious knight has been bitterly lamenting his loss, when Chaucer says to him:

And ye for sorwe mordred yourselve,
 Ye sholde be dampned in this cas
 By as good right as Medea was,

¹ Skeat has pointed out Chaucer's indebtedness for this phrase, *Oxford Chaucer*. 3, 252.

² *Heroides*, 2. 2.

That slow hir children for Jason;
 And Phyllis also for Demophon
 Heng himself, so weylawey!
 For he had broke his terme-day
 To come to hir. (724-731.)

Here for the first time, and for the only time save in the *Man of Law's Prologue* and in the *Legend of Hypsipyle*, allusion is made to Medea's slaughter of her children. Again Chaucer's lines clearly rest upon Jean de Meun's—

Dont ses enfans, quant el le sot,
 Por ce que de Jason les ot,
 Estrangla de duel et de rage. (14198-14200.)

For the more definite *estrangla* Chaucer has substituted the vaguer word *slow*.¹

The next allusion which must be considered is also in the *Book of the Duchess*. Chaucer is describing the room in which he dreamed that he awoke:

For hooly al the storie of Troye
 Was in the glasing ywrought thus,
 Of Ector and king Priamus,
 Of Achilles and Lamedon,
 Of Medea and of Jason,
 Of Paris, Eleyne, and Lavyne. (326-331.)

Vague as this allusion is, it is significant because of its context. We have seen that in all the allusions considered hitherto the suggestion came from the *Roman de la Rose*; but here we find Chaucer associating the story of Medea with those of Hector and Priam, Achilles and Lamedon, as part of the 'storie of Troye.' There indeed in the

¹ One may notice here also the similarity between 'for Jason' and 'Por ce que de Jason les ot.' Cf. above, p. 127.

romance of Troy the story of Jason and Medea may be found, told at length as an introductory episode to the first destruction of Troy, in Benoît de Ste. More and in Guido delle Colonne. That Chaucer knew where the story was to be found does not, of course, prove that he had read it. He alludes often enough to books that he has never read, as do we moderns also. There is nothing in the present allusion, nor in those we have been considering, to suggest that Chaucer had read either Benoît's version of the tale or Guido's till he came to write his *Legend*. Indeed Jason's desertion of Medea for another bride, the phase of the myth which the *Roman de la Rose* makes prominent, is barely touched on by Benoît:

Grant folie fist Medea:
 Trop a le vassal aamé,
 Quant por lui let son parenté,
 Son père et sa mère et sa gent;
 Puis l'en avint molt malement.
 Car si com li auctors reconte
 Puis la lessa a molt grant honte:
 Elle l'ot gari de la mort,
 Puis la lessa; si fist grant tort.¹

Guido's statement is still vaguer: 'Sane diceris pervenisse thesaliam ubi pro thesalum Jasonem civibus inveneranda thesalicis occulta nece post multa detestanda discrimina vitam legeris finuisse.'²

The five allusions thus far considered are all in poems written before the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*. In the *Squire's Tale* (F 548-551) Jason is referred to, along with Paris of Troy, as a type of the lover who deserts one lady for another. In this case Chaucer may

¹ *Roman de Troie*, ed. Joly, 2014-2022.

² *Historia Trojana*, ed. 1486, cap. 6.

well have had his own *Legend* in mind. Indeed the whole episode of the *Squire's Tale* in which the deserted falcon tells of her faithless lover is suggestive of the language of the early part of the *Legend of Medea*; but it is only a suggestion, and will hardly support an argument.

It is the five allusions which precede the date of the *Legend* that are important for this discussion. To sum up the facts which a study of them reveals, it may be said that there is nothing to show that, previous to his composition of the *Legend*, Chaucer had any detailed acquaintance with the Medea myth. That she was a sorceress, that she was deserted by Jason, that because of him she slew her children, is all the knowledge of the story which the allusions reveal. We have seen that this information is all contained in the *Roman de la Rose*, and that the context in four of the five passages points clearly in that direction. The allusions prove further that Chaucer knew that the story was to be found in the *Historia Trojana* of Guido and in the *Epistles* of Ovid, though nothing suggests that he had actually read either account.¹

When he came to write his *Legend*, he found the account in the *Roman de la Rose* too slight, and turned, therefore, naturally enough, to the fuller versions of whose existence he was aware. As Bech² and Skeat³ have shown, Guido's *Historia* is the principal source of the *Legend of Medea*. The conduct of the story, the form of the proper names, paraphrases of Guido's very language, make the indebtedness clear. Only at line 1658,

¹ There is nothing to show that he was in any way acquainted with Ovid's version in *Metamorphoses*, 7, or that he even knew of its existence.

² *Anglia*, 5, 324-332.

³ Oxford Chaucer, 3, xxxviii.

when the story is all but finished, does Chaucer have recourse to Ovid's *Epistle*, a few lines of which he paraphrases. In neither of these versions is the murder of Medea's children related;¹ and hence the episode is not related by Chaucer. //

We must now return to the reference of the Man of Law with which we began:

The crueltee of thee, queen Medea,
Thy litel children hanging by the hals
For thy Jason, that was of love so fals.

What is ostensibly a reference to Chaucer's own poem has been shown to be a confused recollection of Jean de Meun's synopsis, in which a death by strangling has developed into 'hanging by the hals.' The *a priori* inference that the Man of Law's reference is thus to be explained has been strengthened by the evidence furnished by the five allusions that Chaucer's knowledge of the myth, previous to his writing of the *Legend*, was derived from the *Roman de la Rose*. The Man of Law's reference shows a knowledge of the myth no greater in extent, and less accurate in detail, than that in the *Book of the Duchess*:

Ye sholde be dampned in this cas
By as good right as Medea was
That slow hir children for Jason.²

¹ Though Ovid alludes to the episode in the letter of Hypsipyle, as noticed above, there is no suggestion of it in Medea's own letter. Medea vaguely hints at possible revenge; but only a few lines before the end of her epistle she reproaches Jason for giving to their children a cruel stepmother: 'Si tibi sum vilis, communis respice natos: Saeviet in partus dira noverca meos.' *Heroides*, 12, 187-8.

² One may even notice the similarity of phrase between 'For thy Jason' of the Man of Law and 'for Jason' in this passage.

If the *Legend of Medea*, as we know it, was already in existence when Chaucer wrote the *Man of Law's Prologue*, if he had in memory not only his own *Legend* but the fuller versions of the story in Guido and in Ovid's *Epistle of Medea*, which he had consulted in the composition of his *Legend*, it is difficult to see why he should not only misrepresent by his emphasis of Medea's cruelty the general tenor of the poem to which ostensibly he is referring, but should in his detail of 'hanging by the hals' hark back to the meagre version of Jean de Meun which he had found inadequate for the composition of his legend. The Man of Law's reference is, as we have seen, precisely the sort of reference that Chaucer would have made before he had gained fuller familiarity with the story. It seems to me, then, that we are justified in saying that the *Legend of Medea* was written later than the *Man of Law's Prologue*.¹

It cannot be argued against the probability of this conclusion that the Man of Law refers to the story of Medea as already written; for he refers similarly to the stories of other of the good women which, to the best of our knowledge, were never written at all.² If the Man of Law's list refers without distinction to the legends which

¹ If one declines to accept this explanation of the discrepancy between the legend and the reference to it, one must assume either that Chaucer had forgotten his own work, or that he was deliberately misrepresenting it. The first of these alternatives is possible, but hardly probable. One may forget a good deal in the course of years; but surely it is unlikely that Chaucer should forget not only a detail, but the whole tendency of his poem. The second alternative is hardly worth considering unless on the hypothesis that he was planning a revision of the story along new lines. For such an hypothesis there is no color of probability.

² Cf. Lydgate's well-known reference to the unfinished state of *L. G. W.* in his *Fall of Princes* (Morris's Aldine Chaucer, 1, 80).

Chaucer had actually written and to those which he merely intended to write, there is no reason for assigning the *Legend of Medea* to one category rather than to the other.

So far the *Legend of Hypsipyle* has been left entirely out of consideration; but closely incorporated as it is with the *Legend of Medea*, it must have been written at the same time. The two legends constitute one continuous narrative. If the Man of Law's reference to Medea is to an unwritten poem, so also must be his reference to Hypsipyle. It runs thus:

The pleinte of Dianire and of Hermion,
Of Adriane and of Isiphilee.

'The pleinte of Isiphilee' is so vague a reference that we can hope to make but little of it. It is worthy of notice that Hypsipyle and Medea are not mentioned together, though their legends, as Chaucer wrote them, constitute but a single narrative, which might better be called the legend of Jason. In Ovid, on the other hand, five epistles intervene between those of Hypsipyle and Medea. It may be noticed further that, though the 'pleinte' of Ariadne is given by Chaucer at length, that of Hypsipyle is perfunctorily disposed of in ten lines, as a thing 'to long to wryten and to sein'; so that it is far from accurate to describe the legend as the 'pleinte of Isiphilee.' But these considerations are not worth pressing. The two stories clearly go together. Whatever evidence there is concerning the Hypsipyle story tends to strengthen rather than to weaken our main contention.

If it be admitted that the *Legend of Hypsipyle and Medea* was written later than the *Man of Law's Prologue*, its date of composition will be put after 1390, the earliest

date which can be assigned to the latter.¹ But this date for the *Legend of Medea* is at variance with a piece of evidence advanced by Professor Tatlock, which, if valid, places its composition before 1388. In the Prologue of Thomas Usk's *Testament of Love*² there is a clear imitation of a passage in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*.³ In the following lines Professor Tatlock⁴ sees an allusion to Chaucer's Medea legend. Love says:

'Wost thou not wel, I fayled never wight, but he me refused and wolde negligently go with unkyndenesse? And yet, pardè, have I many such holpe and releved, and they have ofte me begyled; but ever, at the ende, it discendeth in ther owne nekkes. Hast thou not rad how kinde I was to Paris, Priamus sone of Troy? *How Jason me falsed, for al his false behest?*'⁵

If this be indeed an allusion to Chaucer's *Medea*, it places the date of the latter before 1388, the year of Usk's death, and of course demolishes the argument of the present paper. A mere allusion to Jason as the type of a false lover, however, proves nothing. It is a trite enough example, as may be gathered from the allusions made by

¹ The date 1390 or later for the *Man of Law's Prologue* rests on the assumption that the Man of Law's reference to the 'cursed stories' of 'Canacee' and 'Tyro Apollonius' is aimed at Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, the first edition of which appeared in 1390. For an excellent statement of the case see Tatlock, *Development and Chronology*, pp. 172-5. In a foot-note on p. 184 of my own *Poetry of Chaucer* I cast doubts on this generally accepted view. Further study has shown me that my note was ill-advised. Despite the inaccuracy of the reference to 'Tyro Apollonius,' which I there noticed, the allusion must be to something recent, or the whole passage becomes pointless. I must accept Dr. Tatlock's just strictures on my note, and hereby revoke it in 'my retracciouns.'

² Ll. 94-114.

³ B. 66-77.

⁴ P. 23.

⁵ *Testament of Love*, 1, 2, 87-93 (*Chaucerian and Other Pieces*, edited by Skeat).

Chaucer himself which we examined above. Professor Tatlock bases his parallel not on the mention of Jason alone, but on the use in this context of the word *falsed*, and quotes two passages from the *Legend of Medea* in which it is used:

Thou rote of false lovers, duk Jasoun . . .
 Ther other falsen oon, thou falsest two. (1368, 1377.)
 Ne sholde her never falsen, night ne day. (1640.)

It may be noticed that in *Usk* it is Love, and not Medea, who is *falsed* by Jason. But apart from this, the verb *falsen* is not so uncommon in fourteenth century writings as to make *Usk*'s use of it significant. Professor Tatlock tells us that the two passages quoted are the only instances of the word in the *Legend of Good Women*. This is true; but in Chaucer's other works the word appears eight times, six times with a person as its direct object, as here.¹ The word is twice used by Gower,² though not with a person as direct object. It hardly seems necessary to pursue the point further.

¹ Arcite 'falsed fair Anelida the quene,' *Anelida*, 147. Criseyde 'falsed Troilus,' *Troilus*, 5, 1053. See also *Book of the Duchess*, 1234; *Troilus*, 3, 784; 5, 1056, 1845; *Cant. Tales*, A 3175; F 627.

² *Conf. Amantis*, 2, 2150; 5, 5182. One may consult further Bradley-Stratmann's *Middle English Dictionary* s. v. *falsen*, and for its use in Old French. Godefroy s. v. *fausser*. Lydgate uses the word in a reference to Jason and Medea in *Temple of Glass*, 63, where the context suggests Chaucer's influence.

II.

If a date not earlier than 1390 be accepted for the *Legend of Medea*, some interesting conclusions may be drawn which concern the *Legend of Good Women* as a whole. Despite the full consideration which has been given to the Prologue in discussions of Chaucerian chronology, but little attention has been paid to the chronology of the individual legends.¹ Until quite recently it has been tacitly assumed that the composition of the legends followed immediately that of the Prologue in its earlier form.² In 1905, however, Professor Lowes, to whom the study of the *Legend* owes so much, argued that the *Legend of Ariadne*, and with it *Phyllis* and probably other of the legends, was composed before the *Knight's Tale*, and hence before the Prologue to the *Legend*.³ Having shown that beyond doubt Chaucer drew for certain details of his *Ariadne* on the *Teseide* of Boccaccio, Lowes proceeds to the conclusion that *Ariadne* is earlier than the *Knight's Tale*, on the grounds that it is 'inherently improbable' that had Chaucer already written the latter, he should later on have given us in the former 'a decidedly inferior and rather sketchy replica of two motives already fully and artistically worked out,' and 'that after he had created

¹ The question is briefly noticed without definite conclusions by Koch, *The Chronology of Chaucer's Writings*, Chaucer Society, 1890, p. 45, and by Ten Brink in *Englische Studien*, 17, 19-20 (1892). Bech discusses the matter at some length, *Anglia*, 5, 379 (1882), but concludes that 'wir müssen . . . auf ein bestimmtes datum [for the conclusion of Chaucer's work on the *Legend*] verzichten.'

² Koch, however, suggests in passing that 'at least [the legend] of Cleopatra must have been finished when Chaucer was writing the Prologue (see l. 566).' *Chronology*, p. 45.

³ *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 20, 802-818.

the very noble and stately figure of Theseus in the *Knight's Tale*, [he] should . . . superimpose upon it in his readers' minds the despicable traitor of the *Legend of Ariadne*.¹ His further argument is a stylistic one, based on the inferiority of Chaucer's verse in the *Ariadne* as compared with the Prologue to the *Legend*. Particular emphasis is laid on the fact that an undue number of lines, one in every 3.7, begin with the word *and*. These arguments have been fully, and to my mind conclusively, answered by Dr. Tatlock.² To his discussion of the matter, in so far as it deals with the contentions of Lowes, I have nothing to add. Other considerations which make against an early date for the legends I shall advance presently.

In 1902 Mr. J. B. Bilderbeck,³ following a suggestion proposed but rejected by Bech,⁴ argued that beginning with 1385, the date assigned by him to the so-called A version of the Prologue, Chaucer produced one legend each year as a birthday tribute to Queen Anne, and that the series was discontinued after her death in 1394. 'From 1385 to 1394 we have a period of *ten* years. There are *ten* good women, whose stories are given in *nine* legends.'⁵ If for

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 809-810.

² *Development and Chronology*, pp. 122-8. To Tatlock's argument that the large proportion of lines beginning with *and* is 'simply Chaucer's rapid narrative style,' one may add that in Tennyson's *Marriage of Geraint* 176 out of 849 lines, or more than 20%, similarly begin with *and*. In his earlier *Morte d'Arthur* the proportion of such lines is less than 14%, while in *Ulysses* there are but 4 such lines out of 70, or less than 6%.

³ *Chaucer's Legend of Good Women*, London, 1902.

⁴ *Anglia*, 5, 379.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 89. The italics are Mr. Bilderbeck's. For the elaborate and ingenious argument by which Mr. Bilderbeck seeks to support his hypothesis the reader must be referred to his own pages. It involves for one thing the date 1390 for the so-called B version

the date 1385 we substitute 1386, which we must now accept as the earliest possible date for the Prologue in its first form, and suppose that the first legend together with the Prologue was presented to the Queen in that year, the eight remaining legends might have been written, one each year, in the eight succeeding years up to and including 1394, the year of the Queen's death. The coincidence of numbers is certainly interesting; but against this notion of a year-by-year composition there are many objections. It is contradicted by Chaucer's own words in the *Legend of Phyllis*, when he tells us that he will 'passe shortly in this wyse' because he is tired of the subject,

And eek to haste me in my legende,
Which to performe god me grace sende. (2456-7.)

He is clearly referring not to the individual *Legend of Phyllis*, but to the *Legend of Good Women* as a whole. If he was doomed to write one legend a year for nineteen years (a rash undertaking, one might add, for a man who in 1386 was not less than forty-six years old), it is hard to see how 'passing shortly' in a single legend was to 'haste' him much in performing the whole work. Furthermore, the hypothesis under consideration would assign to the *Legend of Hypsipyle and Medea* the date 1389, which, as I have tried to show, is at least a year too early. The hypothesis has, after all, as its support only the coincidence in numbers and an over-literal interpretation of the injunction of Alcestris:

of the Prologue, a position which is no longer tenable. Dr. Lowes has pointed out (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 20, 801-3) in a foot-note that Bilderbeck's calculations are in one important particular self-contradictory.

Thou shalt, whyl that thou livest, *yeer by yere*,
 The moste party of thy tyme spende
 In making of a glorious Legende
 Of Gode Wommen.¹

The latest critic to pass judgment on the chronology of the legends is Dr. Tatlock, who returns to the orthodox view that the nine extant legends were all written immediately after the first version of the Prologue, that is, that the *Legend of Good Women* was 'presumably brought to an end by the latter part of 1387.' 'We can hardly believe,' he adds, 'that the *Legends* were continued after the *Canterbury Tales* were once under way.'²

In approaching anew the troublesome question of how and when Chaucer composed his *Legend*, we may begin, I think, by accepting as proved the dates which Lowes and Tatlock have established for the two versions of the Prologue, for the so-called B version, found in all but one of the mss. a date not earlier and probably not much later than 1386, for the so-called A version found in the unique ms. Cambridge Gg. 4. 27, a date not earlier than 1394.³

¹ *L. G. W.*, B 481-4. The A version reads *lyve* for *tyme*, but is otherwise identical. On this passage cf. Bech, *Anglia*, 5, 379.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 130.

³ See the articles by Lowes in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 19, 593-683; 20, 749-864, and Tatlock, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-131. In my *Poetry of Chaucer* (1906), pp. 142-3, in a brief discussion of the two forms of the Prologue, I said that the question of priority had never been satisfactorily settled, but that the probabilities seemed to me to favor the priority of A. I could not agree with Dr. Lowes in denying the identification of Alcestis with Queen Anne in the B version; and granting the identification, I could see no adequate reason why Chaucer should have effaced it in A. Since my book appeared, Dr. Tatlock's restatement and amplification of Dr. Lowes' argument has put the matter in a new light. He accepts the identification of Alcestis with the Queen, and gives

To these dates I shall add that of 1390 or later for the *Legend of Hypsipyle and Medea* which I have tried to establish in the earlier part of this paper. Can anything be determined as to the time when the remaining legends were composed?

Dr. Tatlock has shown that there is some reason for believing that the legends were written in about the order in which they stand in all the mss.¹ To the evidence which he advances in favor of this view I shall add further evidence tending in the same direction.

That *Cleopatra* was the first legend written is rendered probable by the fact that the God of Love at the end of the Prologue, in both versions, orders the poet to begin with it (A 542; B 566). Near the beginning of *Cleopatra* the poet says:

The wedding and the feste to devyse,
To me, that have ytake swiche empryse
Of so many a storie for to make,
Hit were to long, lest that I sholde slake
Of thing that bereth more effect and charge. (616-620.)

Not only do these lines clearly suggest the beginning of a task, they seem also to be a distinct echo of the closing lines of the B Prologue:

I wot wel that thou mayst nat al hit ryme,
That swiche lovers diden in hir tyme;
It were to long to reden and to here;
Suffyceth me, thou make in this manere,

an adequate reason for its effacement in the later version. My own studies lead me to put this reason in a somewhat different form, as will appear presently in this paper; but essentially my position is the same as his. For convenience in referring to the printed text, I continue to use the designations A and B as employed by Skeat.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 128. Cf. Bilderbeck, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

That thou reherce of al hir lyf the grete,
 After thise olde auctours listen to trete.
 For whoso shal so many a storie telle,
 Sey shortly, or he shal to longe dwelle. (B 570-577.)

Finally, Gower's reference in *Confessio Amantis*, 8, 2574-5 to—

Cleopatras, which in a Cave
 With Serpentz hath hirself begrave,

seems, because of the peculiar spelling of the lady's name and the novel manner of her death, to be indebted to Chaucer's legend, which presents both these peculiarities.¹ If so, the *Legend of Cleopatra* must have been in existence before 1390.

Perhaps a bond of connection between *Cleopatra* and *Thisbe* may be found in the similarity of their concluding lines. At the end of *Cleopatra* we read:

Now, er I finde a man thus trewe and stable,
 And wol for love his deeth so freely take,
 I pray god lat our hedes never ake!

The immunity from headache seems not to have been of very long duration, for such a man Chaucer found in *Pyramus*. Near the end of *Thisbe* are these lines:

Of trewe men I finde but fewe mo
 In alle my bokes, save this Piramus,
 And therfor have I spoken of him thus.
 For hit is deyntee to us men to finde
 A man that can in love be trewe and kinde.²

¹ Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, 3, xxxvii; Bech, *Anglia*, 5, 318; Tatlock, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

² L. G. W., 917-921. It may be worth while to notice that in the *Merchant's Tale*, which Tatlock (p. 217) sees reason for dating

I see some reason to think that *Lucretia*, which stands fifth in the series, was written later than Gower's version of the same story in *Confessio Amantis*, 7. 4754-5130. Both poets follow Ovid's account in *Fasti*, 2. 685-852, and anyone who will compare the versions may easily convince himself that each poet had Ovid's Latin before him as he wrote.¹ Both authors, however, depart from Ovid, and from all other accounts of the story which I have read, in making the scene of Tarquin's crime not Collatia but Rome. The passages in which the mistake occurs are these: Chaucer says that Tarquin—

girt him with his swerde, and gan to go;
And forth he rit till he to Rome is come,
 And al aloon his *wey* than hath he *nome*
 Unto the house of Colatyn ful right.
 Doun was the sonne, and day hath lost his light;
 And in he com unto a *privy* halke,
 And in the night ful theefly gan he stalke. (1775-1781.)

Gower says:

And up he sterte, *and forth he wente*
 On horsebak, bot his entente
 Ther knew no wiht, and thus he *nam*
 The nexte *weie*, til he *cam*
 Unto Collacea the gate
 Of Rome, and it was somdiel late,
 Riht evene upon the sonne set . . .
 And as it scholde tho mishappe,

'not later than 1394,' there is an allusion to the story of Pyramus and Thisbe, which in one line seems to echo the phraseology of the *Legend*. Cf.: 'Thogh they were kept ful longe streite overal' (E 2129), and 'Maidens been ykept, for jelosye, / Ful streite, lest they diden som folye,' *L. G. W.*, 722-3. Ovid merely says: 'Sed vetuere patres' (*Met.*, 4, 61).

¹ It is possible that each may have consulted also the account in Livy, Book I, chapters 57-60. Cf. Bech, *Anglia*, 5, 333-6.

Als *priveliche* as evere he myhte
 He rod, and of his hors alyhte
 Tofore Collatines In. (7, 4907-4919.)

Ovid's lines are as follows:

Ense latus cinxit, tergaque pressit equi.
 Accipit aerata iuvenem Collatia porta,
 Condere iam voltus sole parante suos.
 Hostis, ut hospes, init penetralia Collatina. (2, 784-7.)¹

I have indicated by the use of italics several interesting parallels in phraseology. Save for the similar rime *nome: come, nam: cam*, which is, however, a rime common enough in both poets, none of these parallels is very striking; but taken together and in conjunction with the blunder, common to both versions, of substituting Rome for Collatia, they may have some significance. It is easy to see how Gower was misled. Failing to recognize *porta* (785) as an ablative, he put it in apposition with the nominative *Collatia*, and translated the phrase 'Collacea the gate,' adding by way of explanation the words 'of Rome.'² It seems not unreasonable to conjecture that

¹ Livy is briefer and more explicit: 'Paucis interiectis diebus Sex. Tarquinius inscio Collatino cum comite uno Collatiam venit.' 1. 58. 1. Similarly Boccaccio in *De Claris Mulieribus*: 'Nec multis interpositis diebus urgente insania, clam castris relictis nocte uenit Collatium (*sic*).' Cap. XLVI, ed. 1539, fol. xxxii (b). One wonders whether Boccaccio's *clam* or Livy's *inscio Collatino* may not be responsible for Gower's *priveliche* and Chaucer's *privy halke*. The idea is not expressed by Ovid, though it is, perhaps, sufficiently implied in the context.

² The error is repeated earlier in Gower's version of the story, where he is describing the visit of Tarquin and Collatine to the latter's house:

Beside thilke gate of bras,
 Collacea which cleped was,
 Wher Collatin hath his duelling. (4805-7.)

Cf. Macaulay's note in his ed. of Gower, vol. 3, pp. 534-5.

Chaucer, puzzled also by the line, may have consulted Gower for its meaning. It would be characteristic of his general manner that he should 'passe shortly' from Gower's awkward phrase to the simple word 'Rome.' If this be indeed the explanation of Chaucer's blunder, it would put the composition of his *Lucretia* later than that of Gower's seventh book, perhaps later than the publication of the whole work in 1390. There is no reason why it should not have been composed after the *Legend of Medea* which precedes it in the series.¹

That *Phyllis* was written later than *Ariadne* is clearly proved by the explicit reference to the latter story in *Phyllis*, 2459-2461. The lines just preceding (2454-5),

But for I am agroted heerbiforn
To wryte of hem that been in love forsworn,

¹ I have given this piece of evidence for what it is worth, though fully recognizing its doubtful character. Though Ovid explicitly mentions Collatia in the passage just quoted, earlier in his story (line 741) he is very vague. Gower and Chaucer may have been independently misled by the earlier passage. Still there are the verbal parallels noticed above. Chaucer and Gower further agree in making Lucretia swoon at the moment of Tarquin's outrage, a detail which I have found in no other version. Chaucer says:

She loste bothe atones wit and breeth,
And in a swough she lay and wex so deed,
Men mighte smyten of her arm or heed. (1815-17.)

Gower reads:

Wherof sche swounede in his hond,
And, as who seith, lay ded oppressed. (4986-7.)

Ovid merely has:

Succubuit famae victa puella metu. (810.)

One may also compare Chaucer's lines 1740-44 with Gower's 4838-43 and Ovid's 759-60.

prove that its composition followed that of several legends dealing with perjured lovers. Literally interpreted, the phrase, 'hem that been in love forsworn' applies only to Æneas, Jason, and Theseus. This would seem to put *Phyllis* later than *Dido* and *Hypsipyle* and *Medea* as well as *Ariadne*.

'Finally,' as Dr. Tatlock says, 'the signs of haste and weariness . . . become noticeably more frequent and intense toward the end; and it is the last legend that is unfinished.'¹

What evidence there is, then, tends to confirm the view that the legends were composed in the order in which we have them. It is not sufficient to constitute a proof; but in default of any evidence on the other side, it seems to establish a reasonable presumption. If so, a majority of the legends were written after 1390, the earliest possible date for the *Medea*, which stands fourth in the series. Chaucer, then, did not abandon his *Legend* when he conceived the happier idea of the Canterbury pilgrimage, but continued to work spasmodically at both undertakings, writing now a tale for this series, now for that. In this view there is nothing inherently improbable. When he wrote the *Man of Law's Prologue* he apparently intended to complete the *Legend*. One, at least, of the legends we have seen reason for dating later than the *Man of Law's Prologue*. As late as 1394 Chaucer took the trouble to revise the Prologue to the *Legend*.

These considerations raise an interesting question as to the time when Chaucer may be said to have published his poem. The Prologue and individual legends may well

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 128. Cf. also pp. 112-113, and Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, 3, 335-9.

have been read aloud by the poet at social gatherings,¹ and may have circulated in unofficial copies among his friends;² but this cannot properly be called publication. That Chaucer was looking forward to something like publication in the modern sense of the word may be gathered from a couplet in the earlier version of the Prologue:

And whan this book is maad, yive it the quene
On my behalfe, at Eltham, or at Shene. (B 496-7.)

When the book was completed, Chaucer was to present an authorized copy of it to the Queen, transcribed, no doubt, with all the care of which Adam, 'his owne scriveyne,' was capable. The work would then go out from its author's control; other copies could be freely made; and the book could be said to have been 'published.' It is some such giving-out of the book as this which Dr. Tatlock must have in mind when he says that '1387 is the latest date possible for the publication of the whole work.'³

Against the idea that the book was ever formally presented to the Queen, or in any other way officially 'published' during the poet's lifetime, I see a number of

¹ Dr. Tatlock suggests (pp. 110-111) that 'Chaucer had in mind to read [the poem] aloud in a circle of his friends, presumably at court.' To the passages which he cites in support of this conjecture may be added *Phyllis*, 2397-8 and 2401-2. If it was Chaucer's practice to read aloud at court or elsewhere individual legends from time to time as they were composed, the consciousness that their first audience was to be auricular would explain the intrusion of such passages as Dr. Tatlock cites.

² We must assume some such circulation, or at least a reading aloud, to explain Usk's allusion to the Prologue and Gower's to *Cleopatra* noticed above p. 138.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 131.

objections. In the first place it seems unlikely that the book should have been presented to the Queen in an unfinished condition, before it was fully 'maad.' If it was Chaucer's intention, as we know it was, to present it to her ultimately, it would have been discourteous to authorize the circulation of a partial edition in advance. Even if this objection be set aside, and it be maintained that Chaucer published the Prologue and nine legends as an earnest of more to come, it is inconceivable that he should have deliberately given out the ninth legend unfinished, when a dozen lines or less would have served to conclude it.

Secondly, if an authorized edition of the Prologue and several legends had already been given out, and had attained a more or less wide circulation, it is hard to understand why the *Man of Law's Prologue* should refer to eight legends which were never written at all and be silent as to two legends, those of Cleopatra and Philomela, which had already been published. If, on the other hand, we assume that no part of the work had been authoritatively issued, that at most the Prologue and individual legends had circulated in a somewhat narrow circle, that the reading public in general merely knew that Chaucer had such a work in hand, but did not know how much of it was completed, then the *Man of Law's Prologue* takes on the character of an advance notice, a whetting of the literary appetite. So regarded, it ceases to be the curious puzzle it has always seemed. Chaucer was working on his *Legend* and on the *Canterbury Tales* at the same time. He naturally expected to finish the shorter work first. Before the *Man of Law's Prologue* was authoritatively put forth as part of a finished work, the *Legend* would have been concluded. Meantime if Chaucer showed por-

tions of the *Canterbury Tales* to his friends, or read aloud from it, the Man of Law's reference to the *Legend* served as a hint of what was in store.

Finally, the assumption that no authoritative copy of the *Legend* had been issued makes it seem more reasonable that Chaucer should, after the death of Queen Anne, have written the revised version of the Prologue which we know as version A. Had the earlier version of the Prologue, together with some of the legends, actually been presented to the Queen, or in any other way made public, it is hard to see how even the extravagant grief of the bereaved King could have made necessary, or even courteous, the writing of a new Prologue which should obliterate the praises so gracefully rendered in the earlier version. But if Chaucer was waiting to present the finished work and had not formally published any of it, the Queen's death, and the bereaved King's unwillingness to be reminded of his loss, made the earlier version of the Prologue useless, and demanded that it be rewritten before the completed work could be launched.

In view of all the facts, it seems to me highly probable that the *Legend of Good Women* was not authoritatively published during the poet's lifetime. We have seen that he was still at work on it as late as 1394, when he revised the Prologue. Six years later he died, and the *Legend* and the *Canterbury Tales* were both left unfinished. After his death some one put together and published the fragments of the *Canterbury Tales*. In the same way, I fancy, the *Legend of Good Women* appeared. And, as various mss. represent different arrangements of the fragments of the larger work, so one ms. of the *Legend* has the later version of the Prologue, while the rest have the earlier. That the earlier version should be found in

all but one of the extant mss. may well be merely fortuitous, or it may be that Chaucer's friends, who had read it years before in private copies, preferred the earlier version, which all critics, I believe, agree in considering the better. In 1400 King Richard was dead, and there was no need to consider his feelings.

ROBERT K. ROOT.

V.—BROWNING AND THE MARATHON RACE.

The Marathon race was undoubtedly a happy thought on the part of the promoters of the first Olympic games of modern times—those held at Athens in 1896. A well-known member of the French Academy, M. Michel Bréal, gave the prize, and the Greeks set their hearts on winning it. A private correspondent wrote from Athens just before the race took place:—

If the winner is Greek, a tailor has promised him a suit of clothes, a barber has undertaken to shave him for life, a man at a *καφφερείον* has promised him two cups of coffee daily for life, another has promised a dinner a day for a year, another has undertaken to do his washing for life, and another to keep his things ironed, and last, but not least, a lady has offered to marry him.¹

Fortunately the national aspirations were gratified: Greek runners won not only the first, but the second and third prizes also. The contest has continued to attract a great deal of attention at subsequent meetings, and there have been heated discussions about the amateur standing of the competitors and the winners. Since the last race was run at the London Olympic games, the first and second prize winners have been tempted by a too profitable notoriety into professionalism, and it is proposed in some quarters to abandon the race on this account. To those who do not take athletics too seriously, there is a suspicion of humor in this situation, for the original Marathon runner—if there ever was one at all—was undoubtedly a professional. Herodotus, the oldest extant authority, des-

¹ *London Weekly Times*, 1896, p. 309.

cribes him as a *hemerodromes*, a professional courier, a man who in the lack of better means of communication in the early age of Greek civilization earned his living by running at so much a day. Let us turn to the account of the incident given by Herodotus about half a century after the battle took place:—

And first, before they left Athens, the generals sent off to Sparta a herald, one Pheidippides, who was by birth an Athenian, and by profession and practice a trained runner. This man, according to the account which he gave to the Athenians on his return, when he was near Mount Parthenium, above Tegea, fell in with the god Pan, who called him by his name, and bade him ask the Athenians “wherefore they neglected him so entirely, when he was kindly disposed towards them, and had often helped them in times past, and would do so again in time to come?” The Athenians, entirely believing in the truth of this report, as soon as their affairs were once more in good order, set up a temple to Pan under the Acropolis, and, in return for the message which I have recorded, established in his honor yearly sacrifices and a torch-race.

On the occasion of which we speak, when Pheidippides was sent by the Athenian generals, and, according to his own account saw Pan on his journey, he reached Sparta on the very next day after quitting the city of Athens. Upon his arrival he went before the rulers, and said to them:—

“Men of Lacedæmon; the Athenians beseech you to hasten to their aid, and not allow that state, which is the most ancient in all Greece, to be enslaved by the barbarians. Eretria, loók you, is already carried away captive, and Greece weakened by the loss of no mean city.”

Thus did Pheidippides deliver the message committed to him. And the Spartans wished to help the Athenians, but were unable to give them any present succor, as they did not like to break their established law. It was the ninth day of the first decade, and they could not march out of Sparta on the ninth, when the moon had not reached the full. So they waited for the full of the moon.¹

Nothing is said here (it should be noted) of a race

¹ Bk. VI, Ch. 105-6. Rawlinson's Translation.

after Marathon. It was before Marathon that Pheidippides ran, according to Herodotus, and for the very "practical purpose" (to use Professor Ernest A. Gardner's phrase) of obtaining the help of Sparta against the Persian invader; after the Spartans had satisfied their conservative and superstitious scruples, they did send help, but it arrived too late, so that the Athenians and Plateæans had the glory of the victory at Marathon all to themselves. The appearance of Pan to Pheidippides is, of course, rejected by modern historians as a myth. The latest editor of Herodotus, Professor R. W. Macan, thinks that "the introduction of Pan into the Marathonian legend is afterthought, not genuine memory, and Philippides was already out of the way, when the vision in Arkady was fathered upon him." This view is supported by the fact that Cornelius Nepos in his life of Miltiades, probably written in the first century before Christ, says merely that Pheidippides was a professional runner, and that the Athenians sent him to Sparta to say how urgent need there was of speedy reinforcements. These are the only extant authorities the date of which is within 500 years of the battle of Marathon, and they leave us with a solitary and somewhat prosaic fact, stripped of all romantic circumstance and setting.

With the authors of the Christian era we are more fortunate. Plutarch, who died in 120 A. D., in the essay in which he discusses whether the Athenians won greater glory in war or in the arts of peace, has the following passage:—

Thersippus of Erœadæ brought the first news of the victory at Marathon, as Heraclides of Pontus relates. But most report that Eucles, running armed with his wounds reeking from the fight, and falling through the door into the first house he met, expired with these brief words on his lips, "Be of good cheer, we also are of good cheer."

It will be noticed that the name of the runner, given by Herodotus as Philippides or Pheidippides (modern editors prefer the former reading) is here variously reported as Thersippus or Eucles; we have here the first statement of a race after the battle, and the authority given for it is that of Heraclides of Pontus, who flourished about 150 years after Marathon, and who was notoriously inclined to myth; his works have almost entirely perished, and those now extant, so far as I have been able to discover, contain no reference to Marathon. The message put into the mouth of the runner by Plutarch is *χαίρετε καὶ χαίρομεν*, "Be of good cheer, for we are of good cheer." It was Lucian, who, explaining the connection between the message after Marathon and the customary form of salutation among the Greeks, *Χαῖρε*, "Hail!" apparently first used the words which Browning has taken for the motto of his poem: *Χαίρετε νικῶμεν*, "Rejoice, we conquer!" Lucian writes:—

The first who used this phrase [*χαῖρε*] is said to have been Philippides, when on one day he ran from Marathon to Athens to announce the news of the victory to the magistrates who were sitting in great anxiety about the outcome of the battle. "Rejoice we conquer!" Having said this he fell dead in the very act of delivering his message and expired with the word *Rejoice* on his lips.

The quotation of this particular phrase, *Χαίρετε νικῶμεν*, by Browning and the effective use he has made of it in the closing lines of his poem point to Lucian as his most immediate source, though he obviously also read Herodotus, in accordance with his custom of consulting all the authorities on any subject he had in hand. He was the first to combine the Herodotus tradition of the race before Marathon and the vision of Pan, with the later story, told by Plutarch and Lucian, of the race after Marathon,

and the dramatic death of the runner in delivering his message. He dovetailed the two myths with a good deal of skill, and added details of his own invention. These may be briefly noted:—

(1). A happily conceived addition is the branch of fennel which the god gives Pheidippides to carry in token of success, Marathon being Greek for fennel.

“ Say Pan saith: ‘ Let this, foreshowing the place, be the pledge! ’ ”
 (Gay, the liberal hand held out this herbage I bear
 —Fennel,—I grasped it a-tremble with dew—whatever it bode).

(2). Browning makes Pheidippides younger than any of the authorities suggests, and surrounds his personality with an atmosphere of romance which is not found in any previous author, and which is in some respects inconsistent with the social conditions prevailing at Athens in the period of the Persian war. Pheidippides says:

“ I am bold to believe, Pan means reward the most to my mind!
 Fight I shall, with our foremost, wherever this fennel may grow,—
 Pound—Pan helping us—Persia to dust, and, under the deep,
 Whelm her away for ever; and then,—no Athens to save,—
 Marry a certain maid, I know keeps faith to the brave.— ”

Under the system of almost oriental seclusion in which wellborn Athenian women were kept at the time, it is unlikely that Pheidippides would have had the opportunity of making such an acquaintance, or that he would have looked at it in this way if he had.¹ Marriage for

¹ “ In general the Athenian ladies—indeed, the *Greek* ladies without exception—were not even asked to give their consent to the match prepared for them. Parents managed marriages often on both sides, always on that of the woman. The husband was often a complete stranger until the day of the espousals. (See the plays of Plautus and Terence passim, and cf. Eurip. *Androm.*, 951, and Xen. *Econom.*, vii, § 10-11.) ”—Rawlinson, v. 3, p. 417, note 7.

love is a comparatively modern invention, and somewhat rare as a recognized institution even among the nations of to-day. Browning, consciously or unconsciously, here introduces an alien and anachronistic element which probably offends very few of his readers, because most English-speaking people share his romantic predilections.

(3). He also makes, intentionally or unintentionally, a mistake in topography. According to Herodotus, the vision of Pan occurred on Mount Parthenium, above Tegea, which is on the way between Athens and Sparta. Browning changes this to "Parnes' ridge," which is out of the way, as a glance at the map will show; no runner who knew his business, whether amateur or professional, would have left the straight road from Eleusis to Athens, close by the coast, to stray ten miles off into the hills. A former colleague of mine, Dr. John McNaghton, Professor of Greek at McGill University, thinks Browning made the change deliberately, because Parnes is in Attica, while Parthenium is in Arcadia. He writes:—

He must have an Attic hill at all costs, when what he wants to say is that it is the spirit of her own mountains, her own autochthonous vigor, which is going to save Athens. He consciously sacrifices, in a small and obvious point, literal accuracy to the larger truth.

It may be so; but I am inclined to suspect that Browning erred from carelessness, as he did in making his riders who brought the good news from Ghent to Aix go some miles out of their way. Possibly he confused Parnes with Parnon, a ridge in Laconia of which Mount Parthenium might be regarded as an outlying spur. There is no question that Parthenium has, ever since the time of Herodotus, been associated with the vision of Pan. A waterless riverbed there, now crossed by a rail-

way bridge at a height of 230 feet, is still shown to travelers as the scene of the apparition, with more authority than usually attaches to popular tradition. M. Bérard of the French Archæological School, digging in 1889 near the first pier of the railway bridge, found an inscription in bronze, probably connected with the temple to Pan, which Pausanias says existed in his time (last quarter of the second century A. D.) at or near this site. "A little way off," he writes in his description of Mount Parthenium, "there is a sanctuary of Pan, where the Athenians and Tegeans agree that Pan appeared to Pheidippides, and spoke with him."¹

(4). Browning makes the revelation to Pheidippides occur on the return journey, after the delivery of his message to the Spartans. In the original story, as told by Herodotus, this is left doubtful, the suggestion being rather that it was on the journey from Athens. The dramatic effectiveness of this change is obvious.

(5). Browning also attributes the Spartans' refusal of immediate help to jealousy rather than to superstition. This is a point much debated by ancient and modern writers. Rawlinson, among recent historians, ascribed the Spartan delay to envy.² Others have been more inclined

¹ Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, Bk. VIII, Ch. 54. Notes by J. G. Frazer, v. 4, pp. 445-7.

² "Mr. Grote believes that this was no pretence, but the 'blind tenacity of ancient habit' (*Hist. of Greece*, IV, p. 460). We find such a feeling, he says, to abate, but never to disappear in the Spartan history; and he refers to the hesitation shown before the battle of Platæa (*infra*, IX, 7-10) as indicating the *reality* of this motive; but both that and the similar withholding of the bulk of their troops from Thermopylæ (VII, 206) may be explained on selfish grounds, and fail to show that the excuse was more than a subter-

to think the Spartans sincere in their religious scruples. Again, the ascription of the lower motive gives greater dramatic effect.

(6). Browning's Pheidippides addresses the Spartans as if the Persian demand for tribute had just been made. As a matter of fact, it was the year before, and the Persian expedition had been planned in the interval. On the other hand, the poet prolongs the time of the run from Athens to Sparta—a distance of over 130 miles¹—from about a day to two days and two nights—a more reasonable allowance.

(7). Browning amplifies with telling detail the message Pheidippides delivered, the Spartan reply, and the prophecy of Pan, adding the promise of a reward to Pheidippides and the conversation with Miltiades which establishes the connection with the later legend.

fuge. I know but of one occasion in Spartan history where their own interests were plainly attacked, in which a religious motive is said to have had any share in preventing their troops from stirring. In the seventh year of the Peloponnesian war, at the first seizure of Pylos, the occurrence of a festival appears as one out of many reasons of their delay in making a resistance (Thucyd., iv, 5); but it is expressly stated that they made light of the occasion, and thought no hurry was needed."—Rawlinson, v. 3, p. 405, note 9.

¹"The distance from Athens to Sparta by the road is given by Isocrates (*Orat. Paneg.*, 24, p. 171) at 1200 stades, by Pliny (*H. N.*, vii, 20, p. 425), more accurately, at 1140. Moderns estimate the direct distance at 135 or 140 miles. Pheidippides must therefore have travelled at the rate of 70 English miles a day. Kinneir says that this is a rate attained by the modern Persian foot-messengers (*Geograph. Memoir*, p. 44, but see above, vol. i, p. 161, note 4); and Pliny relates that two persons, Anystis, a Lacedæmonian, and Philonides, a courier employed by Alexander the Great, performed the extraordinary distance of 1200 stades (nearly 140 miles) in a single day (*H. N.*, i, s. c.)."—Rawlinson, v. 3, p. 405, note 6.

(8). In the later legend he leaves, but does not stress, a picturesque, but highly improbable detail suggested by Plutarch, who says the runner after Marathon made the journey *σὺν τοῖς ὅπλοις*—in full armor. Browning writes merely:

He flung down his shield,
Ran like fire once more.

Military experts have doubted whether the Athenian hoplites could do a mile at the double, as Herodotus says they did for the first time at the battle of Marathon;¹ and certainly no runner in his senses would carry his armor for twenty-six miles. Another detail suggested by Plutarch the poet omits altogether. The Greek historian says (if Smith's translation of the passage be correct²) that the runner's wounds were still reeking from the fight, and apparently ascribes his death to over-exertion and loss of blood. Browning, much more poetically, attributes his death to excessive joy:

Like to wine through clay
Joy in his blood bursting his heart, he died—the bliss.

If we sum up these items of addition, subtraction, and modification, the general procedure which Browning follows is clear. He is careful of detail when it promotes his artistic purpose, as in the opening of the poem:—

First I salute this soil of the blessed, river and rock!
Gods of my birthplace, dæmons and heroes, honour to all!

¹ See Hauvette, *Herodote*, p. 261; Macon, v. 2, p. 155; Rawlinson, v. 3, p. 416.

² But perhaps *θερμὸν ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης* means simply "hot from the battle." Lucian, however, in a passage occurring a little later than that quoted above, also suggests that the runner was covered with blood.

Then I name thee, claim thee for our patron, co-equal in praise
 —Ay, with Zeus the Defender, with Her of the ægis and spear!
 Also, ye of the bow and the buskin, praised be your peer,
 Now, henceforth and for ever,—O latest to whom I upraise
 Hand and heart and voice! For Athens, leave pasture and flock!
 Present to help, potent to save, Pan—patron I call!

Archons of Athens, topped by the tettix,¹ see, I return!

All this is entirely accurate from the archæological point of view, and it is artistically effective, because it gives us the Athenian atmosphere at the outset. But once this first impression is made, Browning pays no more attention to history, geography, or archæology. He is careless of the facts or he deliberately sets them aside in order that he may convey to his readers the artistic and emotional impression he wishes to produce. So we have in Browning's *Pheidippides* not history, we must admit, but something better than history,—poetry, the nobler art, as Aristotle said long ago, because it deals with fiction rather than fact, the universal rather than the particular. The heroic runner Browning has created for us will live when Marathon records, ancient and modern, are forgotten, because the poem contains noble thoughts, nobly expressed, appealing to the love of beauty and the admiration of self-sacrifice which are lasting characteristics of the heart of man.

JOHN W. CUNLIFFE.

¹ "It was the favorite boast of Athens that her inhabitants were *αἰχμητοὶ*—sprung from the soil. Hence the adoption of the symbol of the grasshopper (Thucyd., i, 6; Aristoph. *Eq.*, 1231; *Nub.*, 955, ed. Bothe). Her territory had never been overrun by an enemy, and so her cities had never been overthrown or removed, like the cities in other countries (compare Herod., i, 56, vii, 171; Thucyd., i, 2; Plat. *Tim.*, p. 10, ed. Tauchn.; *Meneæ.*, pp. 186, 198; Isocrat. *Paneg.*, § 4, p. 166)."—Rawlinson, v, 3, p. 405, note 7. I quote this and other notes from Rawlinson because this was the established edition at the time Browning wrote *Pheidippides*, and very likely to be consulted by him.

VI.—THE PURPORT OF LYLY'S *ENDIMION*.

The Rev. Mr. N. J. Halpin ¹ in 1843, followed by Professor G. P. Baker ² in 1894 and Mr. R. Warwick Bond ³ in 1902, have sought to explain *Endimion* as the vehicle of a personal allegory setting forth a contemporary court intrigue. These commentators have been duly followed in turn, with slight variations, by the historians F. G. Fleay ⁴ in 1891, A. W. Ward ⁵ in 1899, and F. E. Schelling ⁶ in 1908. The existence of this allegory may be regarded, therefore, as generally accepted by authorities on the Elizabethan drama. The exponents of this personal allegory agree in recognizing that Lyly intended to represent the Queen in Cynthia, a point which no one is likely to dispute.⁷ They agree further in arguing that Endimion, the lover of Cynthia, represents Leicester, the favorite of Queen Elizabeth. From this basis three varieties of the allegory have been developed, in attempts to identify a third character, Tellus, the lady deserted by Endimion. Three ladies have been proposed, each of whom played a striking rôle in Leicester's career. Mr.

¹ Shakespeare Soc., London, 1843. *Oberon's Vision in the Midsummer's Night's Dream. Illustrated by a comparison with Lyly's Endimion.*

² G. P. Baker: *Endymion*. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1894.

³ *The Complete Works of John Lyly*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1902.

⁴ F. G. Fleay: *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*. Reeves and Turner. L., 1891. II. 41.

⁵ A. W. Ward: *A History of English Dramatic Literature*. Macmillan & Co. L., 1899. I, 289-93.

⁶ F. E. Schelling: *Elizabethan Drama*. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1908. I, 127-32.

⁷ This had been recognized before, as by Dilke: *Old English Plays*, L., 1814, and William Hazlitt: *Eliz. Lit.*, Lecture, II.

Halpin suggested Lady Sheffield, Leicester's second wife; Professor Baker substituted for her Lady Essex, Leicester's third wife; and Mr. Bond set aside both in favor of Mary, Queen of Scots.

All three versions have two characteristics. First, they do not explain the plot of the play. Mr. Bond admits this repeatedly.¹ He says: "If Mary cannot be credited with any special plots against Leicester, no more can Lady Essex, and hardly, Lady Sheffield." Second, the versions are based, not on positive internal or external evidence, but solely, as Mr. Bond says, on: "a general correspondence between the main facts of the drama and the main facts of the history, a general consonance between the characters and situations of the personages with those of their models."² Such evidence, to be convincing, must be striking, the more so as it is conceded that we know of no fact in history corresponding to the main fact of the drama.

The contention of Mr. Halpin requires no extended discussion. Its deficiencies have been exposed sufficiently by both his successors.³ Tellus is represented by Lyly as a rival to Cynthia, on a plane distinctly above the other ladies of the court,—a representation which would be unrecognizable in the case of Lady Sheffield. Moreover, the final union of Tellus with her lover Corsites, involves the identification of Sir Edward Stafford as Corsites, whereas his character is quite incompatible with that of Corsites. Finally, Leicester's connection with

¹ Bond, II, 90, 102.

² Bond, III, 91.

³ Bond, III, 91. In discussing the proposed personal allegory I have allowed for the contention of Mr. Bond that in many places Lyly intended the allegory to be obscure. This eliminates the minor characters.

Lady Sheffield, contracted in 1573, had ceased to interest the court years before Lyly can have written *Endimion*.

Leicester's sensational marriage with Lady Essex in 1578, when news of it was divulged to the Queen, brought upon him marked disgrace. Professor Baker conceived that *Endimion* was presented as a covert excuse and apology for Leicester's conduct. The difficulties which beset this interpretation have been set forth in a measure by Mr. Bond,¹—but only in a measure. Professor Baker's argument requires as a date for the play the autumn of 1579.² At this moment, however, Lyly's patron and employer,³ the Earl of Oxford, was the last person to desire or permit the presentation of a play on behalf of his hereditary enemy Leicester.⁴ The temporary power of Oxford was concomitant with Leicester's disgrace. And this was the very date (September, 1579) of his famous quarrel with Leicester's nephew and heir, Philip Sidney, whom Oxford called a "puppy," yet failed to challenge when Sidney gave him the lie.⁵ This was not the moment for a protégé of Burghley⁶ and Oxford to plead in behalf of Leicester. Nor did Lyly do so when an opportunity presented itself. In describing the English court, in the second part of *Euphues* (written at this very time), Lyly

¹ Bond, III, *On the Allegory in Endimion*.

² Baker, p. xciv.

³ The second part of *Euphues*, issued early in 1580, is dedicated to: "My very good Lorde and Maister Edward de Vere, Earle of Oxenforde."

⁴ From *Leicester's Commonwealth* (ed. 1641, p. 47) it appears that Oxford's father, as well as his father-in-law Burghley, was a confirmed enemy of Leicester.

⁵ J. A. Symonds: *Sir Philip Sidney*, L., 1886, Macmillan & Co., pp. 66-9.

⁶ See the letter written by Lyly to Burghley from Oxford in 1574. Bond, I, 12-15.

praises Lord Burghley alone¹ and acknowledges his patronage.

To obtain this unpropitious date, Professor Baker is obliged to set aside, without reason,² the positive evidence of the title page of the printed play. Both the quarto and Blount's edition announce that *Endimion* was: "Played before the Queenes Maiestie at Greenewich on, Candelmas day at night, by the Chyldren of Paules." This reduces the date to February 2nd of some year between 1579, when Lyly published *Euphues*, and 1591 when *Endimion* was published. But in 1580 and 1581, different plays were given by different companies.³ In 1582, 1583, and 1584, the Queen was not at Greenwich.⁴ In 1585, the Paul's Boys were not acting.⁵ External evidence, therefore, invalidates any date before 1586.⁶

A late date is equally impossible for *Endimion*. In 1589 and 1591, the Queen was not at Greenwich.⁷ In

¹ Bond, II, 198.

² See Bond, III, 503. Note for p. 17, l. 5. This shows that Professor Baker labored under a misapprehension as to the reading of the title page in Blount's edition.

³ *Revels Accounts* (ed. 1908).

⁴ In 1582, the Queen was at Rochester with Anjou (Nichols' *Progresses*, II, 345); in 1583, at Windsor (*Revels Accounts*, ed. 1908, p. 349); in 1584, at Whitehall (Thomas Birck: *Queen Elizabeth*, L., 1754, I, 45).

⁵ Baker, p. cxxvii.

⁶ These considerations, which forbid an early dating of the play, are confirmed by the absence of any print or registration of *Endimion* during the discontinuance of the Paul's Boys, although three plays by Lyly were published or registered in 1584 and 1585. Again, an examination of the Euphuism in Lyly's plays indicates that although *Endimion* ranks with the earlier group of Lyly's plays, nevertheless, with due allowance for its length, it should be placed after all those which were published or registered by 1585. Compare Clarence Griffin Child: *John Lyly and Euphuism*, Erlangen, 1894, p. 99. Also Bond, II, 289.

⁷ In 1589, she was at Whitehall (Nichols' *Progresses*, II, 26-7), and in 1591, at Richmond (Nichols, III, 74, and Birck, I, 63).

1589-90 the Paul's Boys played before the Queen three times at Richmond; but in the payment made to them on March 10th there is no mention of a performance at Greenwich in February.¹ The date of *Endimion* is, therefore, February 2nd, 1586-8.²

The former date is adopted by Mr. Bond avowedly from the exigencies of his allegory. Later than 1586, a play in which Mary, Queen of Scots, figured as Tellus would be unthinkable; earlier, the identification of Mary's gaoler, Sir Amyas Paulet, as Corsites would be impossible.³ But the difficulties which confront Mr. Bond's version of the allegory are not less fatal than those which disqualify Lady Sheffield and Lady Essex. Mr. Bond admits that the imprisonment of Tellus in charge of Corsites forces him to accept in either Sir Amyas Paulet or his predecessor, the Earl of Shrewsbury, "an ill representative" of Corsites.⁴ To avoid this difficulty, he expounds Corsites as a composite of Paulet and Shrewsbury. When Corsites is rugged and inflexible, he represents Paulet; when indulgent and easily enticed, he represents Shrewsbury. This hybrid Corsites will not serve to explain the fact that Corsites is given to Tellus in marriage: for Mary did not wed either of her gaolers. Moreover, Mr. Bond cannot spare to Corsites the whole of Shrewsbury. He requires that Shrewsbury shall represent also

¹ Bond, III, 111.

² In 1588, the Paul's Boys played repeatedly before the Queen at Greenwich (*Revels Accts.*). Fleay, therefore, dated the play 1588. But since the Queen in April, 1585, commanded the formation of a company of Paul's Boys (Baker, p. cxxvii), the accidental gap in the Revels Accounts in no wise disqualifies 1586 and 1587, though in 1587 the impending execution of Mary, Queen of Scots and the mourning for Sir Philip Sidney may have told against such performances.

³ Bond, III, 11.

⁴ Bond, III, 93.

Geron, the virtuous exile from court who has charge of the fountain for faithful lovers.¹ But he suggests Shrewsbury for Corsites as the gaoler whom Mary by blandishment seduces from his duty, and whose wife charged him with gross incontinence. Mr. Bond, therefore, would have Lyly represent Shrewsbury, in Corsites, as culpably immoral; in Geron, as austere virtuous.

This remarkable dovetailing is not supported by unmistakable allusions in the play. Such arguments are not advanced by Mr. Bond. He contends only for a "general correspondence" of facts, characters, and situations. The keystone of his position is the general representation of Tellus as a much-courted rival of the Queen, once courted by Leicester, and later imprisoned by the Queen. Such a description suggests to us Mary as it suggests no other person.² But Mr. Bond fails to explain Lyly's intention. If Endimion represents Leicester, the play must have been written to please Leicester.³ Mr. Bond does not show how Leicester could have been pleased, or how Lyly could have supposed that he might be pleased, by such an unearthing of his youthful association with Mary, now a quarter of a century past, especially at a moment when Catholic plots were rife, and war against the Catholics was imminent. The play, on this hypothesis, represents Leicester as subject to Mary's influence. To

¹ Geron is not himself a faithful lover (see *Endimion*, III, iii), because he separated from his wife when she engaged in the "vile Arte of enchaunting" (*Endimion*, v, iii, 258).

² Bond, III, 89. Yet Tellus is represented, unlike Mary, as a member of the Queen's court, as one of her "train." See *Endimion*, v, iii, 12.

³ A hypothesis that Oxford, who probably composed plays (see Bond, I, 24), instigated Lyly to write *Endimion* as a subtle attack on Leicester, cannot be advanced in view of the entirely complimentary portrayal of *Endimion*.

represent a court favorite as involved in treasonable practices is an odd way to seek to please him.¹ But, more than this, the resemblance of Tellus and Mary, which appeals to us, may not then have had equal force.

To test Mr. Bond's hypothesis from a more intimate point of view, it is worth while to consider the actual situation at the court. In the winter of 1585-6 Leicester was absent in the Low Countries. He had incurred in January the violent displeasure of the Queen² by flagrant disobedience of her explicit orders. Yielding to pressure, he had accepted in the Queen's name the sovereignty of the Low Countries. He had thus become in the public eye the extreme champion of the Protestant cause. No position would appear to be less likely to suggest enthrallment by Mary, Queen of Scots.³

A more striking interpretation was at that moment inevitable. Thomas Dudley at this time wrote to Leicester⁴—on February 11th: "It was told her Majesty, that my Lady [Leicester's wife, Lady Essex] was prepared presently to come over to your Excellency, with such a train of Ladies and Gentlemen, and such rich coaches, litters, and side saddles, as her Majesty had none such, and that there should be such a court of Ladies, as should far surpass her Majesty's court here. This information (though most false) did not a little stir

¹ To construe the play as a threat by Leicester to take up with Mary unless granted an extraordinary favor is inadmissible because the author must then have been closely associated with Leicester, and not, as Lyly was, with Leicester's enemies.

² Compare the letters of Burghley, February 7th, and Thomas Duddely, February 11th (*Hardwicke's State Papers*, II, 298).

³ Tellus (Latin for *earth*) might more rationally suggest to the audience the territory of the Low Countries.

⁴ *Hardwicke's State Papers*, II, 298.

her Majesty' to extreme choler and dislike of all your doings there, saying with great oaths, she would have no more Courts under her obeysance but her own." Here, indeed, was a Tellus rivalling the splendor of Cynthia. With this rumor rife at court, many of Lyly's audience might be led to identify Tellus with Lady Essex. If *Endimion* was played at Greenwich, February 2nd, 1586, Lyly had grave reasons to fear the displeasure of the Queen and of Leicester's friends at such an identification, and was only prudent in his prologue to the Queen to beg of his hearers not to "apply pastimes."

Thus, in a new form, Professor Baker's contention that Tellus represents Lady Essex, requires consideration. It might be urged that even in 1586 Leicester still had occasion to apologize for his marriage with Lady Essex. An anonymous writer in 1584 accuses Leicester of: "now confessing, now forswearing, now dissembling the marriage: as he will always yet keep a voyd place for a new surcontract with any other, when occasion shall require."¹ In precisely this way Endimion uses Tellus.² The enmity of the Queen toward Lady Essex was such that she was forbidden the court; while Lady Essex, as the same writer states: "raged many months after against her Majesty and is not cold yet; but remaineth as it were a sworn enemy, for that injury."³ Under these conditions, it might suit Leicester's purpose to be represented as in the power of Lady Essex, enchanted by her into an engagement, from which the Queen's favor alone can redeem him. The final marriage of Lady Essex to Corsites becomes intelligible as a parallel to Leicester's actual proposal to

¹ *Leicester's Commonwealth*, ed. 1641, p. 20.

² *Endimion*, II, i.

³ *Leicester's Commonwealth*, ed. 1641, pp. 98-9.

his second wife that she set aside their relations and marry another. Lady Sheffield in time did this. Since the second wife was so disposed of, why not the third? Moreover, a suitable Corsites appears in the Master of the Horse, Sir Christopher Blount, who did marry Lady Essex two years before the play was printed.

If anyone chose to propose this interpretation, he might reasonably claim that the occasion, purpose, and plot of the play, as well as the personalities and relations of the chief characters, were plausibly accounted for. But he would have to encounter one insuperable objection. The play must have been written primarily to please the Queen. Tellus is represented throughout the play, as Mr. Bond notes,¹ on a plane quite comparable to that of the Queen, with whom she is repeatedly contrasted. She receives, indeed, the royal title of respect.² Since Elizabeth was already infuriated by the ostentatiousness of Lady Essex, this could not have pleased her. Furthermore, Endimion, in one scene,³ weighs in the balance the merits of his two loves. He considers the beauty, the wisdom, and honor of Tellus, and does not find her lacking. It is only in *majesty* that she yields to Cynthia. The Queen, then, hears Leicester comparing her with Lady Essex, and finds that she is preferred for her station only, not for her personal accomplishments. The pleasure of Elizabeth at receiving such a malapert compliment is to be imagined rather than described.

Since Tellus cannot be identified as any lady prominently connected with Leicester, the assumption that Endimion represents Leicester is seriously undermined.

¹ *Endimion*, I, ii, 12-32 ; v, iii, 145-51.

² Bond, III, 91.

³ *Endimion*, II, iii, 11-15.

① Endimion is unmarried,—a condition hardly compatible with Leicester's three marriages. ② Endimion, moreover, contrasts forcibly with the soldier Cor̄sites, whereas Leicester from 1585 to 1588 figured conspicuously in military affairs. While there is nothing distinctive about Endimion which inevitably suggests Leicester,¹ there is, on the other hand, good reason to hold that Leicester is not the courtier whom Lyly would be most likely to portray.² Oxford, as well as Leicester, represented himself as an enamored servant of the Queen.³ Lyly was certainly more likely to portray thus his patron, than his patron's enemy. But there were many enamored servants of the Queen. In accord with Lyly's disclaimer of personal references, we should assume that he depicts in Endimion not any one, but the type.

Prior to entertaining new conjectures, it is in order to inquire on what grounds the commentators have assumed that there is in *Endimion* any personal allegory. The author deliberately warns his hearers against doing so. "We hope," he says in the prologue, "none will apply pastimes, because they are fancies . . . Wee present neither Comedie, nor Tragedie, nor storie, nor anie thing, but that whosoeuer heareth may say this, why heere is a tale of the Man in the Moone." The author implies that *Endimion* is not a veiled record of actual occurrences. Nevertheless, the commentators set aside this denial as an instance of "qui s'excuse s'accuse," an

¹The letter of Leicester cited by Professor Baker (p. xlvii), does not differ markedly from the protestations of other servants of the Queen. Compare the letters of Hatton in Sir Harris Nicolas: *Memoirs . . . of Sir Christopher Hatton*, L., 1847.

²For a reply to Professor Baker's suggestion of a connection between Leicester and Lyly, see Bond, III, 95, n. 1.

³John Hannah: *Courtly Poets*, L., 1892, Geo. Bell & Co.

evidence of "something in the performance personally offensive to individuals."¹ They would have Lyly not only insincere, but impolitic. They assume that he purposely prepared a play with allusions which he feared to have understood.²

The grounds for this assumption are not cogent. From the circumstance that Lyly compliments the Queen in his representation of Cynthia, the commentators infer that the remainder of the play must glance at individuals.³ But other plays, as Peele's *Arraignement of Paris* and Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels*, similarly compliment the Queen without involving, so far as we are yet informed, personages of her court. Other plays by Lyly are cited by Mr. Bond as containing personal reference to the Queen alone.⁴ This nullifies the argument. Mr. Bond makes it a second point that: "The language, too, used by Endimion under Cynthia's displeasure is far more appropriate to the Earl of Leicester, suddenly deprived of a favour long enjoyed, than to the shepherd of Latmos."⁵ More appropriate certainly to the genus courtier; but Mr. Bond advances nothing distinctive of any one courtier. Again, he cites

¹ Halpin, p. 51; Baker, p. xlii; Bond, III, 85. Lyly's allusion in the epilogue to "the malicious that seek to overthrow us with threats" need not be personal. More plausibly it refers to the enemies of the Paul's Boys.

² More reasonably one might argue that during the rehearsals such undesirable identifications were proposed. At that time, as (conceivably) in January, 1586, events may have transpired rendering such identifications possible. But in any case the nature of the play, in representing Cynthia's court, rendered attempts at identifications inevitable, and afforded sufficient occasion for Lyly's caveat.

³ Halpin, p. 49-50; Bond, III, 84-5. Professor Baker did not argue at length for the existence of the allegory, contenting himself with proposing identifications which were certainly more plausible than those of Mr. Halpin or Mr. Bond.

⁴ Bond, II, 256.

⁵ Bond, III, 85. He refers to *Endimion*, II, i.

Endimion's dream of a picture of wolves barking at Cynthia, in which Endimion beholds Ingratitude, Treachery, Envy, and creatures which try to suck the lifeblood of "a princely Eagle." "Admit the dream as allegorical," he says, "and the rest must become wholly or partly so."¹ Not only is this a non sequitur, but the only touch of personal allegory here is the Eagle, whom we know from a parallel passage in Euphues,² to be a symbol for the Queen. Such are the scanty positive arguments in favor of the existence of a personal allegory.

The motivating reason is of another sort. Mr. Bond inquires:³ "If the presentation and embroidery of the classical myth were the sole intention, what could have induced the author to drag so lovely a glimpse of ideality down to the vulgar level of Court intrigue? . . . And would a free imagination have gone out of its way to construct the absolutely unessential Corsites, with his futile effort, his pinchings and slumberings, effecting nothing, leading to nothing . . . ?" In short, Mr. Bond cannot understand the play without this allegory. To be sure, he cannot understand the play with this allegory.⁴ In any case, Mr. Bond is persuaded that: "In Endimion, at any rate, the idea of the presence of something more than meets the eye is quite irresistible."⁵

Granting that *Endimion* now appears enigmatic, and

¹ Bond, III, 85.

² See Bond, II, 215, l. 21.

³ Bond, III, 84.

⁴ Mr. Bond admits with reference to his version of the allegory:—"Its weak point is, doubtless, the want of any definite intrigue against Leicester by Mary and Lady Shrewsbury; but the same weakness is inherent in the theory of Mr. Halpin, and in Mr. Baker's emendation of it." (Bond, III, 102). The plot of Tellus against Endimion is the plot of the play.

⁵ Bond, III, 84. Similarly Halpin, p. 49.

respecting the author's deprecation of applying his "fancies," the natural inference is that *Endimion* contains impersonal allegory. In fact, impersonal allegory does exist in *Endimion*, and has been universally recognized.¹ I refer to the physical allegory in which Cynthia represents the moon, Tellus the earth, and Floscula a floweret. This allegory may be extended to new identifications of Scintilla and Favilla as sparks,² subordinate to Semele as flame.³ The names of Dipsas and Corsites appear to be derived from natural history, the former being a serpent whose bite causes violent thirst, the latter a stone used as a remedy for venomous bites and for drugged or enchanted persons.⁴ Since Dipsas enchanted Endimion on the lunar bank, Corsites is appropriately employed by Tellus for his removal. But, beyond this point, physical identifications become implausible. They will not account readily for the plot or for certain characters, as Endimion and Eumenides.⁵ The physical allegory does not make clear the meaning of the play.

However, as Mr. Bond has observed, "the allegory of *Endimion* is twofold."⁶ With the physical allegory, and the slender material of the classical myth, Lyly has interwoven "a drama of court life." A drama of life in general is what Professor Henry Morley⁷ would have us

¹ Bond, III, 81-3.

² Lyly's intention is here clearly marked. See *Endimion*, II, ii, 19-25, 52.

³ Cf. III, i, 14; also Beaumont: *The Glance*: "Two flames, two Semeles, Dwell in those eyes."

⁴ For Corsites see F. de Mely: *Les Lapidaires de l'Antiquité et du Moyen Age*, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1898. Index.

⁵ It is possible that the character Endimion may have been associated, at some stage in the composition of the play, with the fish Scolopidus. Cf. *Endimion*, II, i, 31 and Bond, III, 506.

⁶ Bond, III, 81.

⁷ *English Writers*, IX, 203-8.

believe. He proposes a spiritual or religious allegory. "Throughout," he says, "there is also set forth clearly an impersonal allegory that touches the relation of the mind of man to Earth and Heaven." Professor Morley speaks of "the spiritual aspirations of Endymion," and of "his thoughts of Heaven," as the significance of Endimion's reverent love for Cynthia. He interprets the plot of Tellus to win back Endimion's love as "the spells of Earth over the soul given to heavenward aspiration."

Alluring as this conception is, it cannot be reconciled with the data of the play. Cynthia does not represent Heaven. In the opening scene Eumenides, the constant friend of Endimion, declares to him: "If you be enamored of anything above the Moone, your thoughts are ridiculous, for that thinges immortal are not subject to affections." Endimion replies: "My love is placed neither under the Moone nor above." Cynthia is not represented as an immortal: for when Tellus asks Endimion: "Wilt thou make her immortal?"—he replies: "No."¹ Again, Eumenides checks Endimion in his adoration: "Stay there Endimion, thou that committest Idolatry, wilt straight blaspheme."² These, among many, indications make it clear that Cynthia does not represent Heaven. Cynthia is beyond cavil a Queen in the midst of her court, addressed as "Your Maiestie," and "Your Highnesse."³ It is her "virtues" that are immortal.⁴ The implicit reference to Elizabeth, the royal spectator, whose courtiers customarily figured her under the names Diana and Cyn-

¹ *Endimion*, II, i, p. 33.

² *Endimion*, I, i.

³ *Endimion*, III, i, 59; IV, iii, 96; V, iii, 188, 233.

⁴ *Endimion*, V, iii, 142.

thia is repeatedly apparent,¹ and affects materially the whole conception of the play.

In the classical myth a goddess, overcome by the beauty of a sleeping youth, impulsively kisses him. The dignity and majesty of the Queen compelled Lyly to represent the kiss as a favor, conceded only at entreaty, for an altruistic reason, without suspicion of amorous desire.² The element of personal affection is therefore transferred to the sleeper and becomes inevitably the kind of reverent semi-religious adoration which courtiers were then accustomed to pay the Queen,—a transfiguration of loyal homage in the light of that Renaissance worship of beauty in woman, which Professor J. B. Fletcher has recently set forth so ably.³ Endimion thus becomes a devotee of that Heavenly Beauty, best typified by Cynthia, to the contemplation of which the lover by degrees is raised. By a series of steps he passes from the love of Earthly Beauty to the adoration of Heavenly Beauty. This ultimate infidelity of the lover to his primal passion for Earthly Beauty affords Lyly his opportunity for a plot. The representative of Earthly Beauty, Tellus, in seeking to regain Endimion's love, compasses by magic the sleep from which Cynthia's kiss miraculously liberates him. In the second scene, Tellus unfolds this plot.⁴ She proposes to cast "all allurements of pleasure" before his eyes, and cause "dissolute thoughts" to take root in his head, "insomuch that he shall slake that love which he now voweth to Cynthia and burne in mine." "All his virtues," she exclaims, "will I shadow with vices; his person . . . shall he decke

¹ Bond, III, 85.

² *Endimion*, v, i, 17-24.

³ *The Atlantic Monthly*, October, 1908. Cf. also *Modern Philology*, April, 1908, J. B. Fletcher: *Did Astrophel Love Stella?*

⁴ *Endimion*, I, ii, 41-61.

with such rich Roabes, as he shall forget it in his owne person; his sharp wit . . . shall he use, in flattering of my face, and deuising Sonnets in my favour. The prime of his youth and pride of his time, shall be spent in melancholy passions, careless behauiours, untamed thoughts, and unbridled affections." Such were the characteristics of the Elizabethan courtly lover. Endimion in this guise would be, or would seem to be, once more the servant of Earthly Beauty. The scenic representation of this temporary triumph of Tellus is Endimion's sleep on the Lunary bank, where he reposes till the approach of age;¹ and the appropriateness of this use of lunary is founded in its supposed magical property, that it "causeth nothings but dreames of weddings and daunces."² In these dissolute thoughts and visions of alluring pleasures, the lover wastes away his youth, a captive to the enchantments of Earthly Beauty.

The triumph of Tellus, however, is imperfect. The lunary, as moonwort, is an emblem of Endimion's constancy to Cynthia. She plots further to have him removed from the lunary bank, and her agent in this fruitless attempt is Corsites. Corsites is enamored of Tellus, is a devotee of Earthly Beauty, and therefore represents in contrast to Endimion, Earthly or Sensual Love.³ It is by the force of sensual desire that Earthly Beauty seeks to remove the lover from his constant devotion to Heavenly

¹ *Endimion*, II, iii, 32; v, i, 50. To represent *Endimion* in the acts described by Tellus would have been discourteous to the Queen.

² Lyly: *Sapho and Phao*, III, iii, 43.

³ The characterization of Corsites (Bond, III, 91) as a soldier of great physical strength, tough and unsmoothed nature, and honest simplicity, will be seen to tally with the powerful, untameable, unambiguous nature of desire. His representation as a soldier accords with the mythology of Mars and Venus.

Beauty. When Corsites makes the attempt, he is attacked by fairies, who "with a song pinch him, and he falleth asleep."¹ This is, in folklore, the punishment allotted to sensual affection.² When Corsites awakens, he appears "more like a Leopard than a man,"³—an allusion to the spots of sensuality. The injuries of Corsites are healed by applying lunary,⁴ as the prickings of sensual love are eased by thoughts of marriage. The ultimate marriage of Corsites and Tellus represents the appropriate union of Earthly Love with Earthly Beauty.

Lyly's machinery for the solution of the plot is set in motion by the pity of Cynthia for Endimion. She dispatches various messengers in quest of a remedy,⁵ and one of them, Eumenides, the constant friend of Endimion, learns from an oracle that Cynthia's kiss has the magical property of arousing the sleeper.⁶ Whether Lyly purposed to carry his allegorical meaning further into the details of the play, or permitted it, like the physical allegory, to lapse into obscurity or oblivion, there are, at all events, other resemblances which fancy may convert into identifications. Thus, Eumenides may be thought to represent

¹ *Endimion*, IV, iii.

² Bond, III, 83. Without this significance the episode would be, as Mr. Bond considers it (II, 275), unnecessary and "a blemish." But the contrast of Corsites and Endimion, of Tellus and Cynthia, is fundamental.

³ *Endimion*, IV, iii, 84.

⁴ *Endimion*, IV, iii, 129.

⁵ *Endimion*, III, i, 46-51.

⁶ Lyly gives no indication of an allegorical meaning in this effect of the kiss. Yet, by a happy coincidence it was held by exponents of Platonic love (cf. Castiglione: *Il Cortegiano*, IV, 66), that in a kiss the souls of the lovers blended in the breath, so that the predominating will came to govern both bodies. Thus Cynthia's kiss might exalt Endimion, recalling him from his baser dreams of weddings and dances.

Honor,¹ and Semele, Fame.² Dipsas, the sorceress invoked by Earthly Beauty to enchant the Platonic lover, would seem to be Pleasure;³ while the husband who deserted her, and became custodian of the fountain for faithful lovers, is perhaps Virtue.⁴ The Castle in the Desert may be interpreted as the Castle of Fancy.⁵ But the less these particulars affect the main action of the play, the fewer are the data for identification, and the greater the improbability that Lyly cared to involve an explicit allegorical meaning. Such characters as Bagoa and Floscula, Pythagoras, Gyptes and the lords appear

¹ Eumenides, as the faithful lover who alone can read the oracle of the fountain, who never reveals the name of his beloved (v, i, 17), and will sacrifice his tongue to save hers (v, iii, 228), is still more faithfully the friend of Endimion, who learns from the oracle how to save his friend rather than how to possess his love, and never urges his courtship during Endimion's sleep (v, i, 157). Thus Honor desists from courting Fame while the lover is enthralled by thoughts of marriage, and thus Honor would lose his tongue to preserve that of Fame. (Cf. also *Endimion*, I, ii, 50).

² Semele, whose light nature and waspish tongue are insisted on (cf. p. 183), is yet beloved of Eumenides, who declares: "The least minute being spent in the getting of Semele is more worth than the whole world." (III, iv, 103). Such was the typical Renaissance attitude toward Fame.

³ Dipsas, as the agent of Tellus against Endimion, which Tellus announced as "allurements of pleasure" (I, ii, 42-3), should represent Pleasure. This meaning is conveyed in part by the literal signification of Dipsas, a serpent whose bite causes violent thirst. Apart from her recourse to sorcery, she is an acceptable person (v, iii, 258-70). The function of Pleasure in the plot is to slacken the lover's devotion to Heavenly Beauty (I, iv, 32).

⁴ Geron, cast off by his wife Pleasure when she took to sorcery, then left the court, and lived "fiftie winters" (III, iv, 5) in melancholy and solitude beside the fountain of faithful love. This would seem to be Virtue, cast off by pleasure, and long since an absentee from court.

⁵ The Castle in the Desert, to which Cynthia condemns Tellus in the custody of Corsites (III, i, 40-2) and in which Tellus weaves only images of Endimion (v, iii, 251-2), seems to be the Castle of Fancy, where Sensual Love holds Earthly Beauty in his power.

to be little more than conveniences;¹ while Sir Tophas, who may represent Vainglory in contrast to Eumenides, is associated with maids and pages to provide a comic underplot. The play appears to be a conglomerate, and somewhat "ridiculous for the method," as Lyly admits.² The main incidents and characters, however, though unfamiliar to us, were such as Lyly's audience of enamored courtiers and love-liking ladies could readily interpret. It must be borne in mind that this was a moment when courtly love-making was the vogue, when courtiers and court ladies talked Euphuism, and were tending to the antics described by Jonson in *Cynthia's Revels*. Indeed, the present explanation might well seem halting and imperfect to:

"The absolute Castilio,—
He that can all the points of courtship show."³

Mr. Bond, in allusion to Professor Morley's religious allegory, admits the presence of an impersonal allegory, other than the physical allegory, in *Endimion*, saying that "this ideal aspect of love, and the contrast of such with more earthly passion, certainly forms one aspect of Lyly's play."⁴ Without perceiving the scope and character of this allegory, he senses its presence. He contends only that "such a mystical interpretation" cannot be the main purport of the play. He maintains, therefore, that there

¹ Panelion, nevertheless, seems to typify Compassion (παρ ἔλεος). Cf. *Endimion*, iv, iii, 69-71. Gyptes represents the lore of Egypt, as Pythagoras the philosophy of Greece. Bagoa is probably a feminine form of Bagoas. Floscula, perhaps, conveys also the figurative sense of rhetoric. For several suggestions concerning the minor characters I am indebted to Prof. G. L. Kittredge.

² The Prologue.

³ Marston: *Satires*, I, 27-8.

⁴ Bond, III, 103.

is superimposed upon the physical and "mystical" allegories also a personal allegory. "It by no means follows," says Mr. Bond, "that because the Court allegory can be easily detached and leave the play still interesting and complete, that no such allegory is intended."¹ This is to say that although the author says there is none, and although the play is "complete" without one, and although the plot of the play is not in accord with any particular one, we must still have a personal allegory. Why? Because the author has dragged "so lovely a glimpse of ideality down to the vulgar level of court intrigue." But this is true only on the assumption of a personal allegory. Because of "the absolutely unessential Corsites." But he proves to be absolutely essential. Because, then, "its interests would be enhanced."² Here Mr. Bond is on secure ground. Though the purport of *Endimion* is throughout, transparently, to compliment the Queen, Lyly by his prologue shows consciousness that his audience were likely to seek identifications. We still await success in this endeavor. Meantime, a reason for supporting the author in his denial is afforded by his treatment of Semele. As the beloved of Eumenides, this character stands among those who must be supposed to have been complimented. Yet Cynthia styles her: "Semele, in whose speech and thoughts are only contempt and sourenesse,"³ and again as: "the very waspe of all women whose tongue stingeth as much as an Adder's tooth."⁴ Her lover calls her "of all women the most froward,"⁵ and tells her that her nature "hath been alwaies accounted light." This is hardly a style of compliment which Lyly might expect

¹ Bond, III, 84.

² Bond, III, 84.

³ *Endimion*, IV, iii, 67.

⁴ *Endimion*, V, iii, 204.

⁵ *Endimion*, III, iv, 60.

a lady to take pleasure in.¹ Still less could it please her lover. This lover, according to Mr. Bond, is the courteous Sir Philip Sidney, and Semele is the lady whom he celebrated as Stella. "I do not know," says Mr. Bond, "whether waspishness can correctly be attributed to Stella." On the contrary, Sidney mentions among her virtues:

"That conversation sweet, where such high comforts be."²

To conclude: the suggestion of Mr. Halpin and his followers that there is a personal allegory in *Endimion* proves to be an assumption made without evidence. The variations of this allegory which have been proposed fail to tally with the data of the play, and fail to explain the plot. The author expressly warns his audience not to interpret the play in this manner, and treats one of his chief characters in a way incongruous with any personal reference. The significance of the play is explained in another manner, consonant with the fashion of courtly lovemaking then in vogue. The case for a personal allegory, if it is to be maintained, will have to be restated on better grounds.

PERCY W. LONG.

¹ *Endimion*, III, i, 15. These characteristics are suitable to the disagreeable side of Fame.

² *Astrophel and Stella*, st. 77. He indicates the manner in which Stella received his advances:

"She heard my plaints, and did not onely heare,
But them (so sweet is she) most sweetly sing." (St. 57).

FRENCH PUBLICATIONS IN THE INTERNATIONAL MODERN LANGUAGE SERIES

For First Year Work in Translation

**About—LA MÈRE DE LA MARQUISE ET LA FILLE DU
CHANOINE.**

Collin—CONTES ET SAYNÈTES.

Daudet—LA BELLE-NIVERNAISE.

Fortier—NAPOLÉON.

Guerlac—SELECTIONS FROM STANDARD FRENCH AUTHORS.

**Labiche—LA GRAMMAIRE AND LE BARON DE
FOURCHEVIF.**

Legouvé et Labiche—LA CIGALE CHEZ LES FOURMIS.

Lazare—FRENCH READERS.

De Maistre—LES PRISONNIERS DU CAUCASE.

Meilhac and Halévy—L'ÉTÉ DE LA SAINT-MARTIN.

Mérimée—CARMEN AND OTHER STORIES.

**Moireau—LA GUERRE DE L'INDÉPENDENCE EN
AMÉRIQUE.**

Molière—LE MALADE IMAGINAIRE.

Renard—TROIS CONTES DE NOËL.

GINN AND COMPANY Publishers

Central Office, 29 Beacon Street, Boston

New York

Chicago

London

NEW AND FORTHCOMING BOOKS.

Carter's French Word-Lists.

By B. FRANK CARTER, Instructor in the Stevens School, Hoboken, N. J. vi + 74 pp. 12mo. 25 cents.

This pamphlet includes about 2000 common words. Nouns are classified in groups according to their meaning and other parts of speech are treated separately. A large number of idiomatic phrases are given, and a list of words resembling English words but different in meaning.

Compayré: Yvan Gall

Edited with notes and vocabulary by O. B. SUPER, Professor in Dickinson College. 201 pp. 16mo. 35 cents.

A remarkably interesting story by the celebrated French pedagog, describing a boy's trip around the world. It is in every way well adapted to young pupils in an early stage of their reading.

Hugo: Les Misérables.

Abridged and edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by D. L. BUFFUM, Preceptor in Princeton University. xvii + 566 pp. 16mo. \$1.25.

The full text has been abridged by the omission of all matter not pertaining directly to the progress of the story, such as the description of the battle of Waterloo, the long dissertations on convent establishments and on the riots of 1832, and the description of the Parisian sewers. Other omissions which have necessarily been made include the early history of Fantine and similar episodes. The notes contain brief summaries of the omitted portions.

Baker's German Stories.

Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by Dr. GEORGE M. BAKER, Instructor in Yale University. v + 228 pp. 16mo. (*In press.*)

A collection of short stories by modern German writers, few, if any, of which have previously been edited for class use. The stories include Max von la Roche's *Ein Todesritt*, Charlotte Niese's *Tante Feddersen*, Clara Viebig's *Jaschu*, Leander's *Von Himmel und Hölle*, Leo Goldhammer's *Eine Hochzeitnacht*, Auerbach's *Die Kriegspfeife*, Scheffel's *Hugideo*, and Von Polenz's *Der arme Grule*.

Goethe In Italy.

Edited with introduction and notes by A. B. NICHOLS, Professor in Simmons College, Boston. xvii + 125 pp. 16mo. (*In press.*)

A collection of extracts from the *Italienische Reise*. The selections emphasize Goethe's delight in human nature, his admirable descriptions in the field of natural history, and his entertaining personal adventures.

Henry Holt and Company

34 West 33d St., New York

378 Wabash Ave., Chicago



JUST PUBLISHED

SCHILLER. DIE JUNGFRAU VON ORLEANS

Edited by W. W. FLOBER, Instructor in German,
University of Michigan

70 cents

An edition specially prepared to give students an appreciation of the full literary and dramatic value of the play. The introduction and notes are full and helpful, and the vocabulary complete.

SCRIBE ET LEGOUVÉ. BATAILLE DE DAMES

Edited by CHARLES A. EGGETT, Ph. D.

30 cents

Intended for elementary students, special attention being given in the notes to the use of the tenses and the subjunctive and the explanation of idioms. The introduction discusses the authors and their work, and the vocabulary is complete.

CORNEILLE. LE CID

Edited by Prof. JAMES D. BRUNER,
of the University of North Carolina

45 cents

An edition incorporating the results of long and sympathetic study. The notes elucidate all doubtful points, while the introduction is comprehensive and scholarly.

HEINE. DIE HARZREISE

Edited by Prof. P. R. KOLBE, of Buchtel College

50 cents

A scholarly and interesting edition of Heine's masterpiece, prepared in large part among the scenes it describes. The notes treat of all related topics, and the edition contains also exercises for translation and a complete vocabulary.

*Send for complete catalogue of Modern
Language Text-Books.*

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

J. H. FURST COMPANY

PRINTERS OF

Philological and Scientific Works

ARE FULLY EQUIPPED WITH

**Special Types, Accents, etc., necessary to fill
orders promptly and accurately**

AMONG THE PUBLICATIONS PRINTED BY US ARE

THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN

TRANSACTIONS OF THE ACTUARIAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

And many other works of similar character

Special Attention given to the printing of

DOCTORS' DISSERTATIONS

**In Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Anglo-Saxon, Old English, and the
Romance and Germanic Languages**

CORRESPONDENCE INVITED

J. H. FURST COMPANY

23 S. Hanover Street

BALTIMORE, MD.

REGULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

1. Members wishing to present papers at the meeting are expected to prepare them for that particular purpose. Extremely technical treatises may be read by title. Subjects too large to be treated in an ordinary paper, and topics too special to be of general interest, may be brought before the meeting in the form of abstracts lasting from five to ten minutes. The papers read in full should be so constructed as not to occupy more than twenty (or, at most, thirty) minutes.

2. Every member offering a paper, whether it is to be read in full or not, shall submit to the Secretary, by November 15, with its title, a synopsis of its contents consisting of some fifty or sixty words. He shall state, at the same time, whether he thinks his paper should be presented by title only, summarized in an abstract or read in full. The synopses of accepted papers are to be printed on the program.

3. The Secretary shall select the program from the papers thus offered, trying to distribute the matter in such a way as to make all the sessions attractive. In general not more than an hour and a half shall be devoted to the presentation of papers at any one session. There shall be sufficient opportunity for discussion and for social intercourse.

4. The question of publication is to be decided for each paper on its merits as a contribution to science, without regard to the form in which it has been presented at the meeting.

OFFICERS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICA FOR THE YEAR 1909.

President, MARION DEXTER LEARNED, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Secretary, C. H. GRANDGENT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Treasurer, WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

GUSTAV GRUENER, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

EVERETT WARD OLMSTED, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CENTRAL DIVISION.

Chairman, ARTHUR GRAVES CANFIELD, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Secretary, CHARLES BUNDY WILSON, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

AICÉE FORTIER, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.

CHARLES HARRIS, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

GEORGE HEMPL, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.

JOHN M. MANLY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

LEWIS F. MOTT, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

HENRY A. TODD, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

C. H. GRANDGENT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

CALVIN THOMAS, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

JAMES W. BRIGHT, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

JUN 15 1909
BRIDGE, MASS.

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
OF
AMERICA

EDITED BY
CHARLES H. GRANDGENT
SECRETARY OF THE ASSOCIATION

VOL. XXIV, NO. 2
NEW SERIES, VOL. XVII, NO. 2
JUNE, 1909

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE ASSOCIATION
AT 107 WALKER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
BOSTON POSTAL DISTRICT
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$3.00 A YEAR; SINGLE NUMBERS \$1.00
PRINTED BY J. H. FURST COMPANY
BALTIMORE

Entered November 7, 1902, at Boston, Mass., as second-class matter
under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

VII.—The Staging of the Court Drama to 1595. By ANNA AUGUSTA HELMHOLTZ-PHELAN,	185-206
VIII.—The History of French Fable Manuscripts. By GEORGE C. KEIDEL,	207-219
IX.—Some Disputed Questions in Beowulf-Criticism. By WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE,	220-273
X.—Stella and the <i>Broken Heart</i> . By STUART P. SHERMAN,	274-285
XI.—Reiz ist Schönheit in Bewegung. By WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD,	286-293
XII.—Some Texts of Liturgical Plays. By KARL YOUNG,	294-331
XIII.—Fortune's Wheel in the <i>Roman de la Rose</i> . By STANLEY LEMAN GALPIN,	332-342
XIV.—Chaucer's <i>Medea</i> and the Date of the <i>Legend of Good Women</i> . By G. L. KITTREDGE,	343-363

The annual volume of the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* is issued in quarterly instalments. It contains chiefly articles which have been presented at the meetings of the Association and approved for publication by the Editorial Committee. Other appropriate contributions may be accepted by the Committee. The closing number of each volume includes, in Appendices, the Proceedings of the last Annual Meeting of the Association and its Divisions.

The complete sets of the first seven volumes of these Publications are all sold. The subsequent volumes, comprising all the New Series, may be obtained of the Secretary. The subscription for the current volume is \$3.00. The price of single numbers is \$1.00 each.

Copies of the Report of the Committee of Twelve on Admission Requirements may be obtained of the Secretary. The price is ten cents a copy.

In the absence of the Secretary, July 10, 1909, to August 1, 1910, all communications should be addressed to

W. G. HOWARD,
Acting Secretary of the Association,
25 Conant Hall, Cambridge, Mass.

The next Annual Meeting of the Association will be held at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., on December 28, 29, and 30. The Central Division Meeting will be held at the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., on the same days. Attention is called to the regulations printed on the third page of this cover.

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
Modern Language Association of America.
1909.

VOL. XXIV, 2.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XVII, 2.

VII.—THE STAGING OF THE COURT DRAMA
TO 1595.

It has usually been assumed by historians of the drama that amusements of a dramatic kind at court kept pace with those of the country in general. The entries of 1348 in the Record Books of the Great Wardrobe, which belong to the reign of Edward III, and which concern tunics and visors used in a Christmas celebration, have been interpreted as referring to dramatic entertainments (Collier, I, 15, 22; Warton, II, 72; Brotanek; Ward, I, 148). This view, however, has recently been called into question in the researches of Professor Arthur Beatty, of the University of Wisconsin, who has pointed out that tunics and visors were also necessities of the tournament, that "It is antecedently improbable that Edward III should have had dramatic entertainments on important occasions," and that therefore these important entries do not prove the existence of dramatic entertainments at this early date.¹

¹ Beatty, Professor Arthur: *On the Supposed Dramatic Character of the Ludi in the Great Wardrobe Accounts of Edward III, 1345-1349*. A paper read by title at the meeting of the Modern Language Association, 1908. See program for abstract of the paper.

Subsequent notices of Royal entertainments, so far as court records have been edited, belong to the year 1389, to 1402, to 1416 when the Emperor Sigismund was in London; and to the reign of Henry VI. From this time on such notices become much more frequent. In the records of Henry VI's reign, though no players are named, it is stated that the minstrels belonging to the Household of the king were twelve in number and that they were permanently engaged for the entertainment of the court (Collier, I, 25). These paid servants, often assisted by various members of the court, were undoubtedly the survivors or successors of the minstrels, and are often still so named. The minstrels, in the reign of Edward IV, had been increased to fourteen, and along with them are mentioned besides, eight "Children of the Chappell, founded by the King's Jewell Howse for all things that belong to their apparell by the oversight of the Deane or the Master of the songe, assynde to teach them . . ." (Collier, I, 31 ff.). The records of the reign of Henry VII provide many more notices of court revels and also set down the interesting fact that the king kept three sets of players in his Household to whom he paid a fixed sum besides "rewards," and that the court was further entertained at times by players of the various lords.

But Henry VII was parsimonious in the matter of court amusements as compared with the lavish Henry VIII (Collier, I, 60). In the first year of his reign Henry VIII spent nearly £600 for this purpose alone. Not satisfied with the three sets of players of his predecessor, he added a fourth in 1514. A description of the Revels for the 13th of February of the first year of his reign gives brief but interesting knowledge of one of his entertainments. "After supper his grace with the Quene, Lordes and Ladies came into the White Hall within the said Pallays, which was hanged rychely, the Hall was scaffolded and rayled on al

partes. There was an Interlude of the Gentelmen of his chapell before his grace, and divers fresh songes : that done, his grace called to him a great man or a Lord of Ireland called Odonell, whom in the presence of the Ambassadors he made knyght : then mynstrells beganne to play, the Lordes and Ladyes began to daunce" (Collier, I, 62).

In connection with the various items of payment and record, the name, Master of the Revels, is not used, although it seems more than likely that such was the title given to the officer appointed to organize a Christmas or Easter Entertainment. The evidence for this is found in an *Order for Sitting in the King's Great Chamber*, dated December 31, 1494 (Chambers, *Tudor Revels*, 4). The order provides that "if the master of revells be there, he may sitt with the chapleyns or with the esquires or gentlemen ushers." Under the pleasure-loving Henry VIII, when expenses for court amusement were multiplied many times, the office of Master of the Revels became much more important, as is shown by the fact that courtiers of position and dignity are mentioned as superintending the revels (Chambers, 5). Although the fee of the office was 10s for every day of attendance, it is not probable that the Courtier-Master attended to all of the many details of organization inseparable from the duties of providing the court with amusement. From the beginning of Henry VIII's reign, all such details, as obtaining goods from the merchants, ornaments from the Jewel House and the Mint, engaging architects, carpenters, painters, tailors, embroiderers—actually overlooking the presentation of the play—taking charge of the various properties, making inventories of them, keeping minute accounts, and obtaining funds from the Exchequer, were in the hands of an officer who belonged at first to the Great Wardrobe. In 1534 by a patent granted to an official under the name of the Yeoman of the Revels, with the duties briefly outlined above, the

Revels office technically became a separate department (Chambers, 7).

In the early records, there are many references to an official called the Abbot or Lord of Misrule. Chambers agrees with Collier in the opinion that this functionary was quite distinct from the Master of the Revels. The former was originally appointed for the Christmas season. His duties seemed to have been rather ceremonial than administrative (Chambers, 4).

Among the Lansdowne mss., No. 83, Art. 59, is an interesting document, dated by competent scholars about the year 1573, which furnishes valuable information concerning the office of the Revels, its functionaries and their various duties. The document is described by Chambers in his *Tudor Revels* and is given in full in Albert Feuillerat's Edition of *Documents Relating to the Office of the Revels in the Time of Queen Elizabeth* in volume 21 of Bang's *Materialien* (1908). Only a few of the points can be noticed here. The document opens with the interesting words: "The Office of the Revelles as it should seeme to reporte hath in tymes past bene in that order that the Prince beinge disposed to pastyme would at one tyme appoynte one persone, at sometyme an other, suche as for credite pleasaunte witte and habilitye in learnynge he thought meete to be the Master of the Revelles for that tyme, to sett fourthe suche devises as might be most agreable to the Princes expectacion . . ." (Feuillerat, 5). And in another document these words are found: "The office of the Revells comprisinge all Maskes, triumphes, Plaies, and other shows of dispourte with Banquettinge howses and like devises to be used for the Anornement of the Queenes Maiesties most roiall courte and her highness recreacioun pleasure and pastyme" (Feuillerat, Table 1). Before each show the master and his officers were to meet together and to take an inventory of the

properties. "The chiefe busynes of the office resteth speciallye in three poyntes In makinge of garmentes, In makinge of hedpeces and in payntinge. The Connynge of the office resteth in skill of devise, in understandinge of historyes, in iudgement of comedies, tragedyes and shewes, in sight of perspective and architecture some smacke of geometrye and other thinges wherefore the best helpe is for thofficers to make good choyce of cunynge artificers severally accordinge to their best qualitie, and for one man to allowe of an other mans invencion as it is worthie especiallye to understande the Princes vayne . . ." (Feuillerat, 11-12). The officers were further to agree on the number of workmen and the hours of work for the day and night. It was provided also that three books of account were to be kept, most carefully itemising the results of the frequent inventories, the new goods bought, the amounts paid to various workmen in wages; in fact, all payments made or due.

The holder of the first patent for the Mastership of the Revels was Sir Thomas Cawarden. He received an annual fee of £10 besides the revenue from the sale of old properties, especially costumes no longer of use in the production of Court entertainments. With him were soon associated a Clerk Comptroller whose duty it was to make an inventory of all properties, to issue orders for goods, and a clerk who supervised the cutting of garments and otherwise attended expressly to bookkeeping duties. In addition to these three, the office continued, of course, to include the Yeoman. Up to 1559, when Cawarden's Mastership ceased, the office of the Revels was closely related to that of the Tents, but this relation it is not necessary to explain here.

The properties of the Revels' Office were at first housed in the great Wardrobe. Later, in 1539 or 1540, they were, together with the Tents, at Warwick Inn. While the Tents

were being moved first to one place, then to another, the Revels remained at Warwick Inn until the accession of Edward VI when they were moved to Blackfriars where the Tents already were. On the death of Sir Thomas Cawarden both Offices were removed to the Hospital of St. John's where they remained until the beginning of James I's reign (Feuillerat, 430-1).

After Cawarden's death in 1559, Sir Thomas Benger succeeded to the office of the Master of the Revels. Benger appears not to have been a very effective master, although he made a good beginning in words at least. His activity as Master ceased in 1572, but his duties were performed in his name by the clerk until 1579 when Edward Tilney received the patent of the office. He held the position until 1610.

The average amount spent by the Revels office for court amusement amounted to between £400 or £500 annually. In spite of Benger's protestation of economy, as shown in a note appended to his first Revels' account—in which note he naively says, "that the Chargies for making of maskes cam never to so little a somme as they do this yere for the same did ever amount aswell in the Quenes highnes tyme that nowe is, as at all other tymes heretofore, to the somme of cccc^{li} alwaies when it was Leaste"—he seems not to have been a careful manager (Feuillerat, 111; Chambers, 19). In 1560 the accounts show a debt of £700, and the expenses of 1561, which included a progress, amount to £3,209, 10s, 8d, a princely sum considering the value of money at that time. But this was very unusual even taking into consideration the extravagance of Benger as a master. Immediately after Tilney's accession to the Office the accounts show an increased expenditure over the regular average, but no such extravagance as during Benger's tenure of office is visible on the books at least.

The Revels Records also give much information as to the various duties of the office. At the head of each set of accounts stands an item for "Translatinge newe makinge garnysshing furnysshing and fynysshing of dyuers and sundrye garmentes Apparrell vestures and propertyes aswell of Maskes as for playes and other pastymes sett forthe and shewen in her Maiesties presence with the chaunge and Alteration of the same to serve her Highnes pleasure and determynacion as occasion required from tyme to tyme upon comaundement to be in Areddines when it was called ffor" (Feuillerat, 79). For the year 1571 and 1572 the account books contain a list of six plays produced, on what nights they were given and by what actors, "All whiche.vj. playes being Chosen owte of many and fflownde to be the best that then were to be had, the same also being often perused, & necessarily corrected & amended (by all thafforeseide officers) Then, they being so orderly addressed: were lykewise Thoroughly Apparellled, & ffurnished with sundry kindes, and sutes, of Apparrell, & ffurniture, ffitted and garnished necessarily: & answerable to the matter, person and parte to be played: Having also apt howses: made of Canvasse, fframed, ffashioned & paynted accordingly: as mighte best serve theier severall purposes. Together with sundry properties incident: ffashioned, paynted, garnished, and bestowed as the partyes them selves required and needed . . ." (Feuillerat, 145).

This interesting entry shows that one of the duties of the office was to choose, after having heard several plays, such as would please the court, and if necessary, remodel them to whatever extent it seemed expedient. Other notices refer to the rehearsing of plays. Sometimes the Lord Chamberlain wished to see the rehearsal; on such occasions the players were obliged to appear before him, but most often the rehearsals were held at the Revels Office.

The usual time of the court entertainments, which not only consisted of plays, but of masks, tumbling feats, and other amusements of like kind, was in the evening at Hallowtide, Christmas, Candlemas, Shrovetide, Easter, Whitsuntide, at Progresses, or whenever a royal personage or an ambassador from abroad was present at the court of England.

The place of these entertainments varied with the situation of the court. The Revels' Accounts mention Hampton Court Palace, Greenwich, Whitehall, Westminster, Windsor and Richmond. No doubt entertainments were given in other palaces also.

In Law's *History of Hampton Court Palace* it is stated that Hampton Court Palace was most often favored by the Queen's presence at Christmas, especially in the earlier years of her reign, and that this season was always celebrated with great joviality and rejoicing when the Queen was there. Hampton Court Palace had one of the largest "Great Halls"; it was at least one hundred and eighteen feet long and ninety feet high.¹ Plays were usually given in the Great Hall; although there were other large rooms available. Law states—and it can be proved by the records—that entertainments were presented at this palace with great magnificence. The stage, it is supposed, was customarily erected across the lower end of the hall in front of the screens and minstrels' gallery. It was composed of strong scaffolding, posts, rafters, "having also apt houses: made of Canvasse, fframed, ffashioned & paynted accordingly: as mighte best serve theier severall purposes." In the Great Halls things were most conveniently arranged for the players. The pantry behind the screens at the lower end of the Hall could be used for a tiring room (E. Law, I, 166 ;

¹ Search has failed to reveal the width of this Hall. Travelers through England, however, estimate its width at about fifty feet.

313 ff.). The lighting of the immense Halls was accomplished by drawing wires across the open roof from beam to beam, and hanging lights from them. Sums by no means small were spent on the proper lighting of the improvised theaters. Every account shows careful and artistic attention to the illumination.

Thus far, no account of a court stage, such as has been recently printed in volume XX of the *Publications of the Modern Language Association* from the Latin of John Bereblock concerning the staging of plays at Oxford, has come to light. In the absence of such a document it may be of interest, besides being illuminating because of the comparison which may be drawn, to give in substance what John Bereblock has reported. He is writing of the production of *Palamon and Arcyte* before the Queen. He says that the stage was built in the upper part of the Hall, and that on each side of the stage magnificent palaces and well equipped houses were provided for the actors and for the masked persons. The Hall was brilliantly lighted, and seats and balconies for the Lords and ladies built tier upon tier on the three sides of the Hall. On high—but Bereblock leaves the exact location a matter of dispute—was arranged, suitably adorned and canopied, the seat for the Queen. Whether the stage was built the full width of the Hall is still an open question, but it seems likely that it would be so built, because many of these halls, while very long and high, were nevertheless very narrow, in most cases really necessitating the use of their whole width for the stage.

The actors in the dramas played at court were the Monarch's own company of players, the Children of the Chapel, of Windsor, of Paul's, of Westminster, of Eton, or of some grammar school, the players or children of the various noblemen, and rarely, the Gentlemen of Gray's Inn.

For a long term of years the court players received an annual sum of £3, 6s, 8d each. The children received a gratuity of £6, 3s, 4d which passed in the hands of their masters. The costumes of the players and all the stage properties were furnished by the Revels' Office.

Since documents giving adequate information on the performance of plays before Elizabeth's reign are still in the process of being edited, and since therefore at most, any attempt to picture the staging of the early interludes must be necessarily incomplete, I pass immediately to the reign of Elizabeth, omitting thereby the very interesting Interludes of John Heywood produced at court, only pausing to say that some of the early interludes require scenic apparatus of the simplest; that is, a scaffold upon which to act, although when they were performed at court it may be said with certainty, judging from the scanty accounts now available, that every attempt was made to give them all the magnificence in costume, and all the properties which were called for within the lines and very meagre stage directions. The costumes for the interludes staged in 1516, to cite an item or two, amounted to nearly £250. For 1527 is recorded, "and after all this was the most goodliest disguising, or interlude, made in Latin, the plaiers being so rich and of so strange devices that it passeth my capacity to expound." (Collier, I, 107).

In the Revels' Accounts for the year 1567-8 there is some interesting material as to the scenery and other mechanical contrivances employed in court production. Several plays are noted as having been performed, "The sevoenthe of Orestes and a Tragedie of the kinge of Scottes, to y^e whiche belonged diuers howses, for the settinge forth of the same as Stratoes howse, Gobbyns howse, Oresties howse Rome, the Pallace of prosperitie Scotlande and a gret Castell on

thothere side Likewise . . .” (Feuillerat, 119). A play entitled *Orestes* has recently been printed by Alois Brandl in his *Quellen* (460 ff.), but Feuillerat (449) agrees with Collier (II, 412) that a production of such low description as *Orestes* could never have been presented at court. However that may be, it is nevertheless a play illustrating a certain stage of development in the construction of the drama with reference to stage machinery. It demands practically a balcony stage or what later became a balcony stage; in this play it is a scaffold or an upper stage upon which two of the characters walk and it is high enough to be scaled by a ladder. During the progress of the action a man is hanged upon the ladder and left suspended there for some little time. The entry in the Revels’ Accounts shows also that stage illusion was sought for in the preparing of a painted castle for one side of the stage and another set for the other side, demonstrating that while illusion was sought for, it was rather symbolic than completely realistic as far as indicating place was concerned.

The Revels’ Accounts abound in painters’ items for houses and castles, but only two such items are mentioned for the reign of Elizabeth before the *Orestes* entry in 1567–8. In succeeding years, however, they become more and more numerous and the amount spent upon painting scenery greater and greater.

But if complete realism in stage illusion, as far as scenery was concerned, cannot with absolute certainty be declared to have been practised in the production of a play, it can be said with assurance that realism the most realistic was sought after in the matter of properties. It needs but a glance through the various Revels’ Accounts to convince one of this. In a record for the year 1571–2 the following illuminating entry occurs under the heading,

*"Implementes for propertyes such as sundry playes required provided & employed
by*

John Carow for sundry percells of stuf by him bowghte and provyded for the use of this office & for the plaies maskes & shoves sett foorth thereof by the seide Masters commaundement, videlicet. Sparres, Rafters, boordes, punchyns, Nayles, vices, Hookes, Hinges, Horstayles, hobby horses, pitchers, paper, Braunches of sylke & other garniture for pageantes, fethers, flagbroches, Tow, Trenchers, gloves black, septers, wheate sheaves, Bodyes of men in tymber, Dishes for devells eyes, devices for hell, & hell mowthe staves for banners &c., Bowes, bills, daggs, Targettes, swordes, daggers, fawchins fierworke, Bosses for bittes, speares, past, glew, pacthrede, whipcorde, Holly, Ivy & other greene bowes, bayes & strewing erbes & such like Implementes by him employed at the coorte & in thoffice to acceptable purposes with cariages & Rewardes by him paid in all. Summa—xiiij^{li} ij^s ij^d (Feuillerat, 140).

hunters John Tryce for mony to him due for Leashes, & Doghookes, with staves, & other necessaries: by him provyded for the hunters that made the crye after the fox (let loose in the Coorte) with theier howndes, hornes, and hallowing, in the playe of narscisses, which crye was made, of purpose even as the woordes then in vtterance, & the parte then played, did Requier, for the whiche the same sir Thomas Benger also appointed him to geve certeyne Rewardes the whole amounting to Summa—xxj^s. viij^d. (Feuillerat, 141).

Thunder & Lightning John Izarde for mony to him due for his device in counterfeting Thunder & Lightning in the playe of Narscisses being requested therunto by the seide Master of this office And for sundry necessaries by him spent therin in all xxij^s.

Armour Morris Pickering and William Iening for mony by them disbursed for the hier of certeine Armour for the playe of parris & vienna to furnish the triumphe therin and for Rewards by them geven to the armorers that attended by thappoyntment of the seide Master 5lj^s vj^d.

Bryan Dodmer for mony by him disbursed for A Cristall sheelde & certaine Bumbaste by him delyvered into thoffice & for his expences travell & dilligence in thaffares of this office by the speciall appoyntment of the seide Sir Thomas Benger lx^s (Feuillerat, 142).

Bumbast to make snoballs—v^s 6^d (Feuillerat, 174).

Iohn Carow¹ for sparres to make frames for the players howses; ix^s 6^d.

Canvas for A monster; vij ells

ij spears for the play of Cariclia

A tree of holly for the Duttons playe

other Holly for the forest

A palmers staf

A desk for farrantes playe

An Awlter for theagines . . . (Feuillerat, 175).

The Lynnen
draper Mistris Dane for Canvas to paynte for howses for the players & for other properties as Monsters, greate hollow trees & suche other ^{xx}xij ells at xij^d the ell xij^{ll}. (Feuillerat, 107).

Propertytymaker. To Iohn Rosse for vj branches of flowers made of ffethers—vj^s; ffowers for Garlandes iiij dozen—viiij^s. Long boordes for the Stere of a clowde—vj^s. Pulleyes for the Clowdes and curteynes—iiij^s Bote hier to & fro the Coorte—viiij^s Lynkes to receive the stuf—viiij^d. Dubble gyrtes to hange the soon in the Clowde—xij^d for sowing the curtyns & setting on the frence for the same—iiij^s. Wyer to hang the Curtyns—vj^d. vyces for the pulleys &c.—iiij^s. xlj^s. ij^d. (Feuillerat, 240).

The
Propertytymaker To Iohn Carow in his lyfe tyme not long before his death—vj^{ll}. And to his wyfe after his deathe in full satisfacion for all the wares by him delyvered this yeare into the said office or is to be by him the saide Carow his executors or admynistrators demawnded for any dett due before the third of february 1574 or not entred in this booke—vj^{ll} xiiij^s. iiij^d. as which grew by propertyes videlicet Monsters, Mountaynes, florrestes, Beastes, Serpentes, Weapons for warr as Gvnnes, dagges, bowes, Arowes, Bills, holberdes, borespeares, fawchions daggers, Targetts, pollaxes, clubbes, headdes & headpeeces Armor counterfet Mosse, holly, Ivey, Bayes, flowers quarters, glew, past, paper, and suche lyke with Nayles hoopes horstailles dishes for devells eyes, heaven, hell, & the devell & all the devell I should saie but not all—xij^{ll}. xiiij^s. iiij^d” (Feuillerat, 241).

¹ Record for 1573 and other years.

Although the Revels' Accounts contain many very interesting items under the heading of Mercers' parcels, an idea of the beautiful and expensive materials used for costuming the court plays can best be given from one of the numerous Warrants for Delivery of Stuff from the Wardrobe of the Queen :

“Item to Sir Thomas Benger knighte Master of our maskes Revells and tryumphes for the better furnytüre and settinge forth of the same these parcells followinge That is to saie Of clothe of golde yellowe plaine thirtie Fyve yardes and a half Of cloth of golde yellowe with workes ffoure score foure yardes & three quarters / Of cloth of gold crimson plaine thirtie two yardes three quarters / Of cloth of Siluer plaine ffyvetie yardes half and half quarter / Of veluet purple Twentie yardes. . . . Of veluet Carnacion twentie fyve yardes and three quarters / Of veluet Blewe Bard with gold Seaventeen yardes / Of sateen crimson fouretie foure yardes and a half. . . . Of satten chaungeable striped fouretie and seaven yardes,” (Feuillerat, 187), etc., and so the fascinating warrant runs on and on, and as one reads one is quite sure that modern extravagant costume plays could not excel the magnificence and splendor exhibited in the court drama.

There are one hundred and twenty four plays referred to in the Revels Documents for the reign of Elizabeth, some by title, others as being given by some company and still others simply designated “a play,” besides fifty-seven masques and three shows. It is probable that there were many more because many of the accounts record items without reference to any particular play. Unfortunately, only a very small percentage of plays given at court are extant. But among those which have survived are the dramas of John Lyly. The Revels' Accounts, it is true, do not mention Lyly's name, but there is no doubt about the production of

Lyly's plays at court. The actors in all his dramas except the *Woman in the Moone*, which does not specify the company, were the St. Paul's boys and the Children of the Chapel. Lyly's plays illustrate admirably in their demand for a more elastic stage the advance which had been gradually made in staging. In all of Lyly's plays a rear stage which can be concealed by a curtain is demanded. It is needed for Alexander's Castle and Apelles' studio, for Vulcan's Forge, for Sapho's chamber, for Sybilla's cave, for the Lunary bank and Corsites' castle, for Apollo's shrine, and for several other sets as well. An upper or balcony stage is demanded, for example, as the station of the several planets in the *Woman in the Moone*. This play also requires a trap to represent the hollow vault from which Stesias is to surprise his false wife and her lover. Some of the interesting properties needed for Lyly's plays are the tub for Diogenes, a large tree for Love's *Metamorphoses*, out of which a nymph emerges during the progress of the action, an aspen tree into which Bagoa is transformed, and a hawthorne into which Gunophilus is turned in the *Woman in the Moone*. Considerable ingenuity must have been possessed by the Elizabethan mechanics of the stage to change people into trees and back to nymphs again. "A thick mist which Proserpine shall send" or "a showre" sent by Venus, are in two instances the friendly cover of restoration or transformation.

It is certain that a curtain was used to divide the rear stage from the front stage, just as in the public theaters; it is not so certain, however, that a front curtain was employed, although it seems more than probable that such was the case. The managing of a front curtain in a Great Hall of a palace would not be such an impossible matter as in the public theater with its three open sides. The stage carpenters had merely to stretch a large wire across the Hall and the thing

was done, just as they did for the curtain before the rear stage. There are many items for wires stretched across the Hall in the Revels' Accounts; many items for hundreds of ells of material for curtains, and dozens upon dozens of curtain rings mentioned. The curtains are often provided with costly gold fringe and tassels. In no instance, however, do the Revels' Accounts give any hint as to what specific purpose the curtains were put, whether they were used to conceal the rear stage, the balcony stage, or the front, or all three. The fact that so many of the scenes of Lyly's plays need curtains, suggests the question of whether the rear stage always used for the scenes would not have caused some of them to be lost both to sight and hearing. And in the plays produced at court, where the Halls were loftier than any we now know, this would be more of a real problem than at first appears.

The sort of stage needed for the production of a court drama of a well developed type can perhaps be best illustrated by considering in detail one of Lyly's plays. I choose the *Woman in the Moone*, one of Lyly's later plays, for the reason that it has many times more stage directions than any other play he has left. The reason suggested as to why there is such a goodly number of these much desired directions is that since it is not explicitly stated to have been acted by the Chapel Children or by Paul's, Lyly was not the stage manager, and that he therefore wrote out instructions he was not in position to give orally (Bond, *The Works of Lyly*, III, 236).

The scene of the play is laid in Utopia (Bond III, 280). The characters are Nature and her hand maids, the seven Planets, Utopian shepherds, four in number, Cupid and Jocus, and Pandora, the Woman. Nature, petitioned by the shepherds, creates for them a woman. The treachery of Pandora and jealousy of Stesias, who is her chosen husband,

are the cause of all the complication in the play. The first stage direction of interest to us is that in which Nature bids her maidens, Discord and Concord, to disclose her work. The instruction reads: "they draw the curtains from before Nature's shop, where stands an Image clad, and some unclad, they bring forth the clothed image" (Bond, III, 243). This image turns out to be Pandora.

Then the seven Planets enter and speak jealously about this new creation of Nature. Saturn is the first among them to have his turn to influence her. The stage direction reads "He ascends." Later, when under his influence, Pandora has done all sorts of ungracious things, the direction runs, "Saturne descendeth on the stage" (Bond, III, 248).

In the next act, Jupiter occupies the high place, which is without doubt a balcony stage. When Jupiter who has been holding converse with Pandora below, disappears quickly,—he dare not stay longer because Juno has discovered his whereabouts—Pandora asks, "And art thou clouded up?" suggesting that some device was used for making a mist in the balcony to cover the exit of Jupiter, or perhaps curtains were merely drawn before the balcony and the audience were left to imagine the mist.

The real complication of the plot begins when Venus is in the ascendant, both metaphorically and literally. Gunophilus, the servant of Pandora, plots to betray her to her husband. Stesias asks where he may hide himself in order to witness the banquet which Pandora has provided for her numerous lovers. Gunophilus answers, "O, in this cave, for over this they'll sit." Gunophilus promises to make a sign to him if anything interesting occurs at the banquet. Stesias descends, threatening that if he hears the sign

"And as a strange winde bursting from the earth,
So will I rise out of this hollow vault,
Making the woods shake with my furious wordes."

As the banquet progresses, Stesias gives much evidence that he is extremely uneasy in his cave, for the trap rises slightly more than once. Meanwhile the banquet goes on. Gunophilus brings the dishes and food from the back, showing that in this instance, the trap is in front. The second act ends with the dramatic appearance of Stesias from the trap, but Gunophilus helps to exonerate Pandora.

In the fourth act, the shepherds discover that they all have been duped by Pandora. They straightway tell Stesias, but when he confronts his perfidious wife she manages to clear herself again, and at the same time plans a dexterous revenge on all three of her lovers. She makes appointments with each one in turn to meet her in the evening at different places. Night falls. Stesias enters in woman's apparel and the three swains immediately take Stesias to be Pandora herself. There is a transfer of scene which must be imagined in this play, for the moment after the scene is in the grove, Stesias comes in saying: "This is Enipeus bank, here should she be."

The only point of interest in Act V for the subject under consideration, is that Nature turns Gunophilus into a hawthorne because he has not been a model servant. Nature says :

" Vanish into a Haythorne as thou standest,
Neare shalt thou wait upon Pandora more."

Stesias is commanded to follow Pandora who is set in the moon. He cannot revenge himself upon Pandora, but he can upon the hawthorne. He says :

" Then to revenge me of Gunophilus
Ile rend this hawthorne with my furious hands,
And beare this bush ; if eare she looks but back,
Ile scratch her face that was so false to me."

How the transformation of Gunophilus into the tree was

managed is a question of interest. In the Revels' Accounts several items of hollow trees are recorded among the properties. Perhaps one of the convenient, mists hid the exit into the tree, or simpler still, the tree might have had an open back, invisible to the audience.

There are some interesting questions which immediately occur to the student of the court drama and they are questions which unfortunately, from the present state of our knowledge can be answered in most cases only by conjecture. Was there a front curtain used to discover scenes in the staging of the court drama? If so, were there then three sets of curtains? Was the scenery used movable; in other words, did the production of the play involve sets which could be removed between acts or scenes? There is no manner of doubt about the use of scenery in itself. The Revels' Accounts contain numberless painters' items and references to castles, towns, cities, battlements, pictures, etc. And further, I think there is good evidence to prove that this scenery was painted in perspective. In a document quoted above, concerning the duties of the Revels' Office occur these words, "The Connyng of the office resteth in skill of device, in understandinge of historyes, in iudgement of comedies, tragedyes and shewes, in sight of perspective and architecture, some smack of geometrye and other things wherefore the best helpe is to make good choyce of connyng artificers severally according to their best qualitie, and for one man to allowe of an other mans invencion as it is worthie . . ." (Feuillerat, 11, 12).

Two views may be taken of the situation, but first let us look at the facts. The Revels' Accounts give the clearest evidence that curtains were used, as do also some of the plays; that scenes were painted, most likely in perspective; that elaborate and realistic properties of almost every conceivable description were provided; that rich costuming was

the practice from the earliest times ; that very often extravagant sums were expended in the production of court entertainments ; and that Elizabeth thought so much of this department of her Household that she from time to time granted special commissions to her Masters of the Revels. which would enable them effectively to carry on their office. It may with no little color of truth be contended that a people who could write such plays as were staged in Elizabethan times, who had such vast sums to draw upon as the court coffers provided, who were, it must be believed, very clever workmen, who understood the art of building, decorating and painting, who knew very well how to make a room artistic, would know how to produce perfect stage illusion, and would use their ingenious wits to this purpose, not only by the aid of a front curtain disclosing the scenes, but by movable, perspective scenery as well. They could hang a sun in a cloud by means of pulleys ; could they then not move a castle and quickly put a country house in its place ?

The other view which may be taken is this : the Revels' Accounts afford, it is true, the clearest evidence that scenery was used in conjunction with curtains, but evidence is quite lacking to show to what use the latter were put, or that the stage could be set in the modern way by movable scenery. Creizenach (3, 571 ff.), is of the opinion that the "howses aptly paynted" mentioned in the Records were immovable when once set. A palace supposed to be miles away was placed on one side of the stage, while a country dwelling or city was placed on the other ; the spectator was left to imagine the distance between them. And since he could imagine one or the other of these sets away, he could also imagine away if necessary both sets, if the location suddenly demanded a woodland spot which was perhaps indicated by a tree standing on the stage the whole time. This state

of things did not strike the spectator as incongruous. The stage pictured to him was not real, but symbolic. Such realistic illusion as was obtained resulted from the use of very realistic properties. The spectator of plays was accustomed to this sort of imperfect illusion and incongruous setting from very early times; therefore he was not disturbed by it. That illusion was not perfectly observed can be proved by the use of Diogenes' tub in *Alexander and Campaspe* alone, not to mention others of Lyly's plays which afford evidences of the same kind. Bond supposes the tub thrust on and off as needed, its presence on the stage pointing to a transfer to the market place or street. If the old stage traditions are adhered to,—and history shows that stage customs have a way of living on and on and that people are very conservative about customs,—the tub most probably stayed on the stage all the time; when the action did not demand its use the good people who looked at the production of the court play simply did not see it; their imaginations were equal to this task. Of course, some of the stage property were no doubt moved; there would be no reason why they should not be. The rear stage with its curtains, and the balcony perhaps, always provided a friendly cover for changing the scenes and the properties. But the point is that the Elizabethan spectator would not be in the least disturbed by having a bed chamber scene on the rear stage, while the front stage might be set with a castle on one side, a country house supposed to be a long distance away on the other, and a tree in the center or off at one side, pending the moment when a scene was to be located in a grove, the tree being symbolic of the grove.

What we have to base our idea of the staging of the court drama upon is simply this: evidence, and plenty of it, that curtains were used somewhere on the stage; evidence of a front, back, and balcony stage, with the additional elasticity

afforded by a trap ; evidence in the Revels' Accounts of an abundant use of realistic properties and rich costumes ; in short, a stage conforming in its broad outlines to that of the public theaters, but richer in its furnishings and costumes and more realistic in its more numerous properties, because the king's treasury stood behind its business manager. But until, in some manuscript not yet given to the world, is found a detailed description or a careful picture, absolutely authentic of the stage as erected in great Halls of Palaces, and until evidence is really adduced that curtains hung in front and that scenes could be and were shifted for every scene and act, the weight of the evidence will be with those who hold to the theory of incongruous staging, inharmonious as that may seem to modern pampered eyes and imagination. Such a theory, besides, accords with historical custom and development.

ANNA AUGUSTA HELMHOLTZ-PHELAN.

VIII.—THE HISTORY OF FRENCH FABLE MANUSCRIPTS.

Although French fable literature played a prominent part in the evolution of the *Æsopic Fable* in the Middle Ages, no general account of its history and development has as yet been written by any modern scholar. Single collections of French fables dating from this period have been published from time to time in more or less critical editions, and certain phases of the more general field have been investigated by various scholars, but it is believed that the present paper may justly claim to be the first general survey of Old French Fable Literature within certain well-defined limits.

The special object here held in view will be to give a succinct bibliographical account of all the manuscripts at present known to contain collections of *Æsopic fables* in the vernacular of North France, while attempting more particularly to trace their history as far back as may be towards the Middle Ages. It would of course be too much to expect of a first attempt of this sort that any great degree of completeness should be attained, or that no errors of fact should have crept in, but the detailed statements given are intended as a general guide to the investigator in this field who is interested in the original manuscripts themselves.

The facts here presented have been noted down as opportunity offered since October, 1891, and they have been obtained in many different ways, especially by personal research in the *Bibliothèque Royale* at Brussels, the *Bibliothèque Nationale* at Paris, and the *Library of Congress* at Washington. Whenever feasible the various items of fact here given have been obtained at first hand, but in many instances it was unfortunately necessary to rely on other sources of information.

It would be impracticable in a bibliographical article such as this to give all the pertinent references to printed works from which facts have been obtained, and therefore only data as to manuscript sources have been included in the foot-notes ; while acknowledgments to the various European and American scholars who have been of assistance from time to time can only be hereby made in this very general way.

In general it may be stated that the evidence which we can bring to bear on a problem of this sort may most conveniently be divided into three categories : (1) the extant manuscripts themselves ; (2) the constructive manuscripts inferred from internal evidence ; and (3) the descriptions found in Mediæval catalogues, inventories, and accounts. It may well be added that it is very probable that the last two categories of evidence mentioned still offer great opportunities for further investigation on the part of the modern scholar.

LIST OF EXTANT MANUSCRIPTS.

I. (Ab. 1175 A. D.) MARIE DE FRANCE, *Esope*.

1. Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 10296 (since 1837 = ms. restored to the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne in Bruxelles by the French in 1815 = ms. transferred to the Bibliothèque Nationale from the Dépôt des ci-devant Cordeliers in Paris in 1796 = ms. taken from the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne in Bruxelles by the orders of the Convention Nationale in 1794 = ms. of Albert et Isabelle, † 1621 and 1633 = ms. of Marguérite d'Autriche, † 1530 = ms. bought by Marguérite d'Autriche from Charles de Croy, Prince de Chimay, in 1491¹ = ms. with autograph of Charles de Croy, Conte de Chimay from 1482 to 1486 = ms. copied by Jehan Wag' in Picardy, 1428.) Vidimus, June 24, 25 and 26, 1897.
2. Cambridge, University Library, Ee. 6. 11. (= 2. 7. 8, ab. 1750 = #. D. Ø. 8, ab. 1650 = Lib : 30, Class : 9 Or., ab. 1640 = Lib : 31, ab. 1625 = 181, in 1600 = ms. copied ab. 1225.)
3. Chantilly, Musée Condé, 1330. (= ms. of Henri d'Orléans, Duc d'Aumale, † 1897, purchased from J.-J. Techener ab. 1858, kept at Twickenham near London until ab. 1871, when it was removed

¹ See Lille, Bibliothèque Municipale, B. 1511, fo 382.

- to Chantilly = ms. of J.-J. Techener when described by Paulin Paris in 1857 = ms. copied near Besançon or Luxeuil ab. 1250.) The reference to this ms. was found by G. C. Keidel in the Library of Congress in 1906.
4. London, Library of the British Museum, Cotton Vespasian B. xiv. (= ms. of Sir Robert Cotton, † 1631 = ms. copied in England ab. 1290.)
 5. London, Library of the British Museum, Harl. 978. (= ms. of Sir Robert Harley, † 1724 = ms. probably copied in the Abbey of Reading, Berkshire, England, ab. 1250.)
 6. London, Library of the British Museum, Harl. 4333. (= ms. of Sir Robert Harley, † 1724 = ms. copied by a French scribe ab. 1250.)
 7. Oxford, Bodleian Library, 21706. (= Douce 132, in 1834 = ms. of Fr. Douce before 1820 = ms. of an old library at Edwardstone near Sudbury, Suffolk, England = ms. copied ab. 1300.)
 8. Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, fr. 3142. (= anc. B. L. F. 175 = ms. of the Comte d'Artois, in 1793 = ms. of the Marquis de Paulmy, B. L. 1622, † 1787 = Duc de la Vallière Sale, in 1786 = L. J. Gaignat Sale, 1750 for H. 200-2, in 1769 = ms. of J.-B. Denis Guyon de Sardièrre, 527, in 1759 = ms. known to Sainte-Palaye and the Comte de Caylus, ab. 1740 = ms. copied ab. 1290.) Vidimus, Aug. 7 and 9, 1897.
 9. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 1446 (since 1860 = anc. 7834^{3.3} = Fonds Colbert 1436, in 1732¹ = ms. of J.-B. Colbert, † 1683 = ms. copied ab. 1325.) Vidimus, July 20, 1897.
 10. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 1593 (since 1860 = anc. 7615, in 1682² = ms. of Claude Fauchet, † 1601 = ms. from which a poem was copied by Claude Fauchet about 1596 and published by Antoine Loisel, † 1617 = ms. with note by Claude Fauchet at the bottom of fo 1 ro : "C'est a moy Claude Fauchet, pour eschange fait avec M. de Roissi contre une cronique françoise" = ms. of M. de Roissi (Henri de Mesmes), † 1596 = ms. copied ab. 1250, but never completed by the rubricator.) Vidimus, July 7, 8 and 20, 1897.
 11. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 1822 (since 1860 = anc. 7856^{3.3} = Fonds Colbert 4154, in 1732³ = ms. of J.-B. Colbert, † 1683 = ms. copied ab. 1290.) Vidimus, July 21, 1897.

¹ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. fr. 5692, fo 166 b.

² Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, fr. 2768, contains copies made from this ms. (Vidimus, Aug. 3 and 4, 1897.)

³ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. fr. 5692, fo 358a.

12. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 2168 (since 1860 = anc. 7989.² = Fonds Baluze 572, in 1719 = ms. of Étienne Baluze, † 1718 = ms. copied ab. 1250.) Vidimus, July 21, 1897.
13. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 2173 (since 1860 = anc. 7991, in 1682 = ms. of Hippolyte de Béthune, † 1665 = ms. copied ab. 1350.) Vidimus, July 21, 1897.
14. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 4939 (since 1860 = anc. 9616, in 1682 = ms. of Florimont Robertet, † 1522 = ms. of Deciternes = ms. copied ab. 1500.) Vidimus, July 26, 1897.
15. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 12603 (since 1860 = Supplément fr. 180, in 1820 = ? ms. of the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne at Bruxelles taken to the Bibliothèque Royale at Paris by the orders of Louis XV, in 1748 = ms. of Marguérite d'Autriche, † 1530 = ms. bought by Marguérite d'Autriche from Charles de Croy, Prince de Chimay, in 1491¹ = ms. of Charles de Croy, Conte de Chimay from 1482 to 1486 = ms. copied ab. 1300.) Vidimus, July 20, 1897.
16. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 14971 (since 1860 = Supplément fr. 632.²⁸, in 1820 = Inventaire de Gérard 676, in 1797 = ms. transferred to the Bibliothèque Nationale from the Dépôt des ci-devant Cordeliers at Paris, in 1796 = ms. taken from the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne at Bruxelles by the orders of the Convention Nationale, in 1794 = Inventaire de Franken 497, in 1731 = Inventaire de Viglius 465, in 1577³ = ms. described in the Inventaire de 1556 = ms. described in the Inventaire de 1536 = Inventaire des Livres et Volumes en la Chambre de la Garde des Joyaulx, Brouxelles, Nov. 15, 1487, No. 468³ = Inventaire de la Librarie qui est en la Maison à Bruges, No. 661, ab. 1467³ = Inventaire des Livres Roumans de Philippe le Hardi fait à Paris, Mar. 20, 1404, No. 12⁴ = ms. copied ab. 1350.) Vidimus, July 23, 1897.
17. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 19152 (since 1860 = Fonds St.-Germain, fr. 1239, ab. 1800⁵ = Abbaye de St.-Germain des Prés, No. 1830, ab. 1740 = Abbaye de St.-Germain des Prés, Fonds Coislin, ab. 1731 = ms. of H.-C. du Cambout de Coislin, No. 733.², † 1735⁶ = ms. of Pierre Séguier, † 1672⁷ = ms. copied ab. 1300.) Vidimus, July 23, 1897.

¹ See Lille, Bibliothèque Municipale, B. 1511, fo 382.

² Described in Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 11675-11676, fo 171 vo. (Vidimus, June 25, 1897.)

³ Lille, Archives de l'ancienne Chambre des Comptes.

⁴ Dijon, Archives de l'ancienne Chambre des Comptes.

⁵ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. fr. 5457, p. 39.

⁶ See ms. catalogue formerly in the Abbaye de St.-Germain des Prés.

⁷ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 2105 was copied from this ms. ab. 1650.

18. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 24310 (since 1860 = Fonds Navarre 85, ab. 1800 = Collège de Navarre 356, in 1741¹ = Bibliotheca regia Navarræ, A. 6. 356, in 1708² = ms. with note : "Pro libraria regalis collegii Campaniæ alias Navarræ" = ms. copied ab. 1450.) Vidimus, July 23, 1897.
19. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 24428 (since 1860 = Fonds Notre-Dame 193, in 1756 = Notre-Dame de Paris, Fol. M18, bef. 1756³ = ms. of Claude Joly, † 1680 = ms. of Antoine Loisel, † 1617 = ms. of Mestre Nicolas de Lessy in 1412, when he lent it to Frere Jehan Cotusse, gardien des Freres Mineurs de Sens = ms. copied ab. 1270 from an original written by Omons in 1265.) Vidimus, July 23, 1897.
20. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 25405 (since 1860 = Fonds Notre-Dame 242⁴, in 1756 = Notre-Dame de Paris, 4to E6, bef. 1756⁴ = ms. with note by J. Besly, † 1644 = ms. with note by Claude Fauchet, † 1601 = ms. of Étienne Pasquier, bef. 1581 = ms. copied ab. 1350, although a note on one of the fly-leaves gives the date as 1204.) Vidimus, July 24, 1897.
21. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 25406 (since 1860 = Fonds Notre-Dame 192, in 1756 = Notre-Dame de Paris, Fol. M17—also erroneously given as M7, or M27—bef. 1756⁵ = ms. of Claude Joly, † 1680 = ms. of Antoine Loisel, † 1617 = ms. with note by Claude Fauchet, † 1601 = ms. of Frere Joham Cholet, ab. 1450 = ms. copied ab. 1290.) Vidimus, July 24, 1897.
22. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 25545 (since 1860 = Fonds Notre-Dame 274⁶, in 1756 = Notre-Dame de Paris, 4to N2, bef. 1756⁶ = ms. copied ab. 1325.) Vidimus, July 10, 12, 15 and 26, 1897.

¹ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 9371, fo 15b.

² Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 4161 (olim 3137), p. 225.

³ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 4629 (olim 839 F), p. 179.

⁴ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 4629 (olim 839 F), p. 193.

⁵ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 4629 (olim 839 F), p. 179.

⁶ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 4629 (olim 839 F), pp. 202-204. This ms. is also mentioned in the autograph ms. of Étienne Barbazan, Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, fr. 3519, pp. 150-151 (Vidimus, Aug. 14, 1897), and in Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, fr. 2765, fo 1 ro (Vidimus, Aug. 2, 1897). Moreover, Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, fr. 3123, contains copies made from this ms. (Vidimus, Aug. 5, 1897).

23. Roma, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottoboni 3064. (=ms. deposited in the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana by Pope Benedict XIV, in 1740 = ms. which Pope Alexander VIII purchased from Queen Christina of Sweden and presented to the Ottoboni family of Rome in 1689 = ms. which Queen Christina of Sweden purchased from Alexandre Petau, in 1650 = ms. of Alexandre Petau, No. 567, in 1650¹ = ms. of Paul Petau, † 1614 = ms. with note by Claude Fauchet, † 1601 = ? ms. of Pierre Daniel, † 1603 = ? ms. of the Abbaye de Fleury-sur-Loire, in 1562 = ms. copied ab. 1400.)
24. York, Minster Library, xvi. K. 12. 1. (=ms. twice brought to Coburg, Germany, by Herzog Alfred von Sachsen-Coburg-Gotha, ab. 1895 = ms. copied in England ab. 1225.)

II. (Ab. 1200 A. D.) AVIONNET DE YORK.

1. York, Minster Library, xvi. K. 12. 1. (=ms. twice brought to Coburg, Germany, by Herzog Alfred von Sachsen-Coburg-Gotha, ab. 1895 = ms. copied in England ab. 1225.)

III. (Ab. 1250 A. D.) AVIONNET DE PARIS.

1. Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 11193 (since 1837 = ms. restored to the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne in Bruxelles by the French in 1815 = Inventaire de Gérard 676, in 1797 = ms. transferred to the Bibliothèque Nationale from the Dépôt des ci-devant Cordeliers in Paris in 1796 = ms. taken from the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne in Bruxelles by the orders of the Convention Nationale in 1794 = Inventaire de Franken 458, in 1731 = Inventaire de Viglius 876, or 875, or 821, in 1577² = ms. of Marguérite d'Autriche, † 1530 = ms. bought by Marguérite d'Autriche from Charles de Croy, Prince de Chimay, in 1491³ = ms. with autograph of Charles de Croy, Conte de Chimay from 1482 to 1486 = ms. copied ab. 1365.) Vidimus, June 24, 25 and 26, 1897.
2. London, Library of the British Museum, Addit. 33781. (=Grenville XIII, in 1848 = Payne and Foss cat., I. 8, in 1843 = ms. described in Fr. Douce's letter to Thos. Grenville, received Mar. 28, 1816 = ms. copied ab. 1345.)
3. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 1594 (since 1860 = anc. 7616, in 1682 = anc. 842 = anc. 1333, ab. 1650 = ms. copied ab. 1325.) Vidimus, July 27, 1897.

¹ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 9372.

² Described in Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 11675-11676, fo 224 ro. (Vidimus, June 26, 1897.)

³ See Lille, Bibliothèque Municipale, B. 1511, fo 382.

4. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 1595 (since 1860 = anc. 7616³ = Fonds Cangé 106, in 1733 = ms. of Châtre de Cangé, bef. 1733 = ms. copied ab. 1450.) Vidimus, July 28, 1897.
5. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 19123 (since 1860 = Fonds St.-Germain, fr. 1622, ab. 1800¹ = Abbaye de St.-Germain des Prés 2287, ab. 1740 = Abbaye de St.-Germain des Prés, Fonds Coislin, ab. 1731 = ms. of H.-C. du Cambout de Coislin, No. 78², † 1735³ = ms. of Pierre Séguier, † 1672 = ms. copied ab. 1450.) Vidimus, July 28, 1897.
6. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 24310 (since 1860 = Fonds Navarre 85, ab. 1800 = Collège de Navarre 356, in 1741⁴ = Bibliotheca regia Navarræ, A. 6. 356, in 1708⁴ = ms. with note: "Pro libraria regalis collegii Campaniæ alias Navarræ" = ms. copied ab. 1450.) Vidimus, July 23, 1897.

IV. (Ab. 1250 A. D.) YSOPET DE CHARTRES.

1. Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale, 620. (= anc. 261 = ms. of Chapitre de la Cathédrale de Chartres = ms. copied ab. 1250.)

V. (Ab. 1250 A. D.) YSOPET DE LYON.

1. Lyon, Bibliothèque de l'Académie, 57. (= ms. in the Bibliothèque Municipale de Lyon from 1793 to 1825 = ms. described in Delandine's catalogue, 673, in 1812 = ms. in the Bibliothèque de l'Académie de Lyon, bef. 1793 = ms. of Pierre Adamoli, † 1769 = ms. with name of original owner which was later erased, ab. 1290 = ms. copied in the Franche-Comté ab. 1290.)

VI. (Ab. 1270 A. D.) YSOPET DE CHELTENHAM.

1. Cheltenham, Phillipps Library, 16230. (= Middlehill, Phillipps Library, 16230, until 1862 = G. Libri Sale in 1859, No. 58 = E.-F. Corpet Sale in 1858, No. 840 = ms. of Masson de Saint-Amand, in 1805 = ? ms. of Évreux, Bibliothèque Municipale, ab. 1795 = ms. of an "abbaye près de Paris" in 1407 = ms. copied in the Eastern part of Normandy ab. 1275.)

VII. (Ab. 1325 A. D.) AVIONNET DE MILAN.

1. Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, N. sup. 168. (= ms. copied by a North Italian scribe ab. 1325.)

VIII. (Ab. 1325 A. D.) YSOPET DE MILAN.

1. Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, N. sup. 168. (= ms. copied by a North Italian scribe ab. 1325.)

¹ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. fr. 5459, p. 22.

² See ms. catalogue formerly in the Abbaye de St.-Germain des Prés.

³ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 9371, fo 15 b.

⁴ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 4161 (olim 3137), p. 225.

IX. (Ab. 1325 A. D.) YSOPET I DE PARIS.

1. Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 11193 (since 1837 = ms. restored to the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne in Bruxelles by the French in 1815 = Inventaire de Gérard 676, in 1797 = ms. transferred to the Bibliothèque Nationale from the Dépôt des ci-devant Cordeliers in Paris in 1796 = ms. taken from the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne in Bruxelles by the orders of the Convention Nationale in 1794 = Inventaire de Franken 458, in 1731 = Inventaire de Viglius 876, or 875, or 821, in 1577¹ = ms. of Marguérite d'Autriche, † 1530 = ms. bought by Marguérite d'Autriche from Charles de Croy, Prince de Chimay, in 1491² = ms. with autograph of Charles de Croy, Conte de Chimay from 1482 to 1486 = ms. copied ab. 1365.) Vidimus, June 24, 25 and 26, 1897.
2. London, Library of the British Museum, Addit. 33781. (= Grenville XIII, in 1848 = Payne and Foss cat., I. 8, in 1843 = ms. described in Fr. Douce's letter to Thos. Grenville, received Mar. 28, 1816 = ms. copied ab. 1345.)
3. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 1594 (since 1860 = anc. 7616, in 1682 = anc. 842 = anc. 1333, ab. 1650 = ms. copied ab. 1325.) Vidimus, July 27, 1897.
4. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 1595 (since 1860 = anc. 7616³ = Fonds Cangé 106, in 1733 = ms. of Châtre de Cangé, bef. 1733 = ms. copied ab. 1450.) Vidimus, July 28, 1897.
5. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 19123 (since 1860 = Fonds St.-Germain, fr. 1622, ab. 1800⁴ = Abbaye de St.-Germain des Prés 2287, ab. 1740 = Abbaye de St.-Germain des Prés, Fonds Coislin, ab. 1731 = ms. of H.-C. du Cambout de Coislin, No. 78⁵, † 1735⁶ = ms. of Pierre Séguier, † 1672 = ms. copied ab. 1450.) Vidimus, July 28, 1897.
6. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 24310 (since 1860 = Fonds Navarre 85, ab. 1800 = Collège de Navarre 356, in 1741⁵ = Bibliotheca regia Navarræ, A. 6. 356, in 1708⁶ = ms. with note: "Pro libraria regalis collegii Campaniæ alias Navarræ" = ms. copied ab. 1450.) Vidimus, July 23, 1897.

X. (1332 A. D.) JEHAN DE VIGNAY, *Ysopet de la Mireoir Historial* (Livre IV, chap. 2-8).

1. Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 434. (= ms. sent to the

¹ Described in Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 11675-11676, fo 224 ro. (Vidimus, June 26, 1897.)

² See Lille, Bibliothèque Municipale, B. 1511, fo 382.

³ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. fr. 5459, p. 22.

⁴ See ms. catalogue formerly in the Abbaye de St.-Germain des Prés.

⁵ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 9371, fo 15 b.

⁶ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 4161 (olim 3137), p. 225.

Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris to be photographed by Dr. M. P. Brush, in 1905 = anc. 117, H. 19 = ms. in Besançon, Abbaye de St. Vincent, in 1739 = ms. of Abbé J.-B. Boisot, No. 4, in 1664 = ms. of Antoine Perrenot, Cardinal de Granvelle, † 1586 = ms. taken from the Librairie du Louvre, bef. 1424¹ = Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de 1413, No. 145² = Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de 1411, No. 149³ = Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de Gilles Mallet dressé en 1373 et récolé en 1380 par Jean Blanchet, No. 238, or 241⁴ = ms. with note by Charles V, King of France, stating that it was copied by his orders in 1372.)

2. Leiden, Universiteits-Bibliotheek, Vossianus gallicus, folio 3 A. (= ms. of Isaac Vossius, † 1689 = ms. referred to in Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de 1413, note written ab. 1415: "Le duc de Guienne manda à Jean Maulin et à J. le Bègue de bailler ces quatre volumes à mons. de Bavière"⁵ = Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de 1413, No. 4⁶ = Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de 1411, No. 4⁷ = Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de Gilles Mallet dressé en 1373 et récolé en 1380 par Jean Blanchet, No. 17⁸ = ms. bound for Charles V, King of France, in 1377⁹ = ms. with note by Charles V, King of France, ab. 1365 = ms. of Jean II le Bon, King of France, in 1364 = ms. with note by Jehan, duc de Normandie et de Guienne, ab. 1340-1345 = ms. copied ab. 1340.)
3. London, Library of the British Museum, Royal 14. E. 1. (= ms. known to David Casley, in 1734 = ms. copied for Henry VII, King of England, at Bruges, ab. 1500.¹⁰)
4. London, Library of Henry Yates Thompson, 19 Portman Square, W. (= ms. bought by Quaritch for £1290, in 1906 = ms. at Sotheby Sale, Dec. 14-15, 1906 = Inventaire de la Librarie qui

¹ Missing in the Inventaire de 1424: Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, Q. 5. f.; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, H1934.

² Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 9430.

³ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 2700.

⁴ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 2700 (No. 238), and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Baluze 397 (No. 241).

⁵ See Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 9430, fo 1 vo.

⁶ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 9430.

⁷ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 2700.

⁸ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 2700, and in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Baluze 397.

⁹ See Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Clairambault, Sceaux 216, p. 9667, dated at Vincennes, Nov. 23, 1377.

¹⁰ This ms. was probably copied from the ms. described in the Inventaire de la Librarie qui est en la Maison à Bruges, No. 181, ab. 1467, preserved among the Archives de l'Ancienne Chambre des Comptes at Lille. See next item below.

est en la Maison à Bruges, No. 181, ab. 1467¹ = ms. referred to in a note written ab. 1450: "Madame a ces III livres en prest"² = Inventaire de Marguerite de Bavière made at Dijon by Jehan de Quielent, Jan. 25, 1423, No. 1³ = Inventaire de Dijon in 1420, No. 149 = ms. referred to in note: "Donné au duc de Bourgogne, le 9 février 1413" = Inventaire de 1413, No. 123⁴ = ms. restored to Jean, Duc de Berry, by the Prevost de Paris as a gift from Charles VI, King of France, ab. 1410 = Inventaire de 1402, No. 943⁵ = ms. confiscated by the Prevost de Paris = ms. of Messire Jehan de Montagu, † 1409 = ms. of Jean, Duc de Berry = ms. copied ab. 1375.)

5. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 50 (since 1860 = anc. 6731, in 1682 = anc. 542 = Fontainebleau, Librairie de François I, in 1523 = ms. confiscated by François I from the Connétable de Bourbon, No. 164, in 1523 = Moulins, Librairie du Duc de Bourbon, 1488-1523 = ms. of Pierre de Beaujeu, 1477-1488 = ms. confiscated by Louis XI from Jacques d'Armagnac, duc de Nemours, when he was beheaded in 1477 = ms. copied by Gilles Gracien for Jacques d'Armagnac, duc de Nemours, in 1463.)
6. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 308 (since 1860 = anc. 6930, in 1682 = anc. 257 = ms. finished before Sept. 6, 1455.)
7. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 312 (since 1860 = anc. 6934, in 1682 = anc. 62 = Inventaire de Livres appartenant au duc d'Orléans: Livres à recouvrer, No. 26 ab. 1440,⁶ = ms. referred to in the Compte Messire Jehan de Rochechouart, June 1, 1427, No. 2⁷ = Inventaire de la librairie de Blois, May 31, 1427, No. 32 = Inventaire de la librairie de Blois by P. Renoul in May, 1417, No. 33⁸ = ms. illuminated for Louis, Duc d'Orléans, under the supervision of Thevenin Angevin by Jan. 3, 1396⁹ = ms. copied for Louis, Duc d'Orléans, under the supervision of Thevenin Angevin by Raoulet d'Orliens by Feb. 12, 1395. This ms. is now exhibited in the Galerie Mazarine, x. 27.) Vidimus, July 16, 1897.
8. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 316 (since 1860 = anc. 6938, in 1682 = anc. 412 = ms. with note: "An se livre du premier volume du Vincent historial a hystoires xvi^{xx}," ab. 1450 = ms. with note: "Cest volume fu achevé l'an de grace mil CCC et xxxiii,

¹ Lille, Archives de l'ancienne Chambre des Comptes.

² See Inventaire de Dijon in 1420, No. 149.

³ Lille, Archives de l'ancienne Chambre des Comptes.

⁴ Described in Paris, Archives Nationales, reg. KK258.

⁵ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 11496.

⁶ Described in Paris, Archives Nationales, reg. K534.

⁷ Described in Paris, Archives Nationales, reg. K269.

⁸ Described in Paris, Archives Nationales, reg. K534.

⁹ Described in Paris, Archives Joursanvault, No. 839.

la veille sainte Katerine," i. e. Nov. 24 = ms. probably copied for Queen Jeanne de Bourgogne under the supervision of Jehan de Vignay himself, in 1333.)

9. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 6354 (since 1860 = Supplément fr. 46¹, in 1820 = ms. bound with the monogram of Napoléon I^{er}, ab. 1810, indicating that it probably came from the library of an émigré at the time of the Revolution, ab. 1790 = ms. of Philippe, Comte de Béthune, in 1662 = ms. with the coats of arms of Tanneguy du Châtel, † 1477, and of his wife Jeanne Raguenel de Malestroit = ms. copied ab. 1450.)
10. Roma, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. 538 (= Reg. 675, in 1739 = ms. which Pope Alexander VIII purchased from Queen Christina of Sweden and deposited in the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana in 1689 = ms. which Queen Christina of Sweden purchased from Alexandre Petau in 1650¹ = ms. with note: "Alexander Pauli filius, senator Parisiensis, anno 1649" = ms. of Paul Petau, † 1614 = Inventaire de Prigent de Coëtivy, No. 1, in 1450 = ms. with note: "Dame sans per. A Prigent. Ce livre est a Prigent, seigneur de Rais, de Coëtivy et de Taillebourg, conseiller et chambellan du corps du roy et admiral de France," after 1443 = ms. of owner whose name has been erased, ab. 1440 = ms. copied ab. 1425.)

XI. (Ab. 1350 A. D.) YSOPET II DE PARIS.

1. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 15213 (since 1860 = Supplément fr. 766, in 1820 = ms. which was probably confiscated from an émigré at the time of the Revolution, ab. 1790 = ms. taken from the Librairie du Louvre bef. 1424² = Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de 1413, No. 74³ = Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de 1411, No. 75⁴ = Librairie du Louvre, Inventaire de Gilles Mallet dressé en 1373 et récolé en 1380 par Jean Blanchet, No. 121, or 122⁵ = ms. copied ab. 1370.) Vidimus, July 29, 1897.
2. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 24432 (since 1860 = Fonds Notre-Dame 198, in 1756 = Notre-Dame de Paris, Fol. M21³, bef. 1756 = ms. of Perrenette de Pluvot = ms. of Denis Lucey, 1566 = ms. copied after 1332.) Vidimus, July 29, 1897.

¹ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 9372.

² Missing in the Inventaire de 1424: Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, Q. 5. f.; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, H1934.

³ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 9430.

⁴ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 2700.

⁵ Described in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 2700 (No. 121), and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Baluze 397 (No. 122).

XII. (1479 A. D.) JULIEN MACHO, *Esopet en François*.

1. Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Institut Royal de France, 4to. 145 (in 1828 = Paris, Première Bibliothèque de l'Hôtel de Ville, B. L. 147, ab. 1780 = ms. copied ab. 1480.)

XIII. (1482 A. D.) COLART MANSION, *Dyalogue des Creatures*.

1. Paris, Boutourline Sale in 1839, No. 483. (= ms. of Dmitri Petrovitch Boutourline, † 1850 = Catalogue of Boutourline Library in 1831, No. 77 = ms. of Francisque de Bethencourt, 28 desembre, 1628 = ms. of Francisque de Bethencourt's father, bef. 1628 = ? ms. of Marguérite d'Autriche, † 1530 = ? ms. bought by Marguérite d'Autriche from Charles de Croy, Prince de Chimay, in 1491¹ = ms. with autograph of Charles de Croy, Prince de Chimay after 1486, † 1521 = ms. copied by Bertoulet Lebrun, in 1482.)
2. Wien, Bibliotheca Palatina, 2572. (= olim Eug. f. 63 = ms. copied ab. 1485.)

XIV. (Ab. 1490 A. D.) YSOPET III DE PARIS.

1. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 983 (since 1860 = anc. 7304, in 1682 = anc. 816.1 = anc. mmxcii = ms. of Charles IX, King of France, † 1574 = ms. with note: "Ce liure appartient a maistre Pierre Paulmier, examinateur de par le Roy nostre sire ou Chastellet de Paris," ab. 1500 = ms. copied ab. 1490.) Vidimus, July 29, 1897.

By way of conclusion a few general statements may be made concerning the bibliographical list just given.

The fourteen collections here described are contained in forty-nine separate and distinct manuscripts, some of which include two or three sets of fables. Of these manuscripts all but two, or perhaps three, are now in public libraries.

It is evident from the number of manuscripts which contain the fables of Marie de France that this collection was the most popular of them all in the Middle Ages.

A closer inspection will reveal certain other interesting facts. At present the majority of the manuscripts in question are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris,

¹See Lille, Bibliothèque Municipale, B. 1511, fo 382.

but in earlier centuries this was not the case. About two hundred years ago the library of Notre-Dame de Paris had five of the fable manuscripts, while in the sixteenth century Claude Fauchet seems to have owned four of them. Still earlier we find four of these manuscripts in the possession of Charles de Croy, Comte de Chimay (later Prince de Chimay).

Most of the manuscripts here enumerated were copied in France, a few of them in England and Belgium, and one in Italy. At the present time they are preserved in the libraries of France, England, Belgium, Holland, Austria, and Italy. It seems likely that a few more fable manuscripts will come to light in the future, but of all those copied in the Middle Ages probably one-half have already perished by fire or otherwise. That the statement just made is approximately true will appear by a consideration of the number of constructive manuscripts posited by the respective editors of those collections that have already been published.

In many cases it is extremely difficult to trace the history of the individual manuscripts for more than a century, and the further back we go the greater is the obscurity which surrounds them. Up to the present no manuscripts have been traced back to the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, but three to the fourteenth, and only eleven to the fifteenth century. Of the history of the remainder comparatively little is known, and even in the case of the others there are often large gaps in the line of library tradition as here recorded.

It is to be hoped that in the years to come still more light will be thrown by further investigations among the sources of French literature in the Middle Ages upon the attractive field of the *Æsopic Fable*, and it is the intention of the writer of the present article to treat somewhat fully at a later time of the descriptions of French fable manuscripts found in Mediæval catalogues, inventories, and accounts.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

IX.—SOME DISPUTED QUESTIONS IN BEOWULF-CRITICISM.¹

The Scandinavian analogues to the adventures of Beowulf are of considerable interest to students of the Anglo-Saxon epic. Stories of this type, occasionally affording striking resemblances in detail, appear in distant countries,—among the Japanese and the North American Indians, for example,—but these are clearly of little significance for the evolution of the tale on Germanic soil. And we need hardly attach more weight to the feats of the Celtic hero Cuchulinn, nearer neighbor though he be, than to those of Tsuna in Japan.² The case is different with parallels in *märchen* and *saga* found among the very peoples by whose kinsfolk the deeds in the epic must have been celebrated. In two instances the story is told of heroes of later times. Grettir the Strong, who subdues two trolls, one in a hall and the other in a cave under a waterfall, was a historical character of the eleventh century, and Orm Storolfsson, whose struggles with a demon cat and a giant recall in many ways the deeds of Beowulf, flourished some two centuries later. The validity of a third parallel, in the *Saga of Hrolf Kraki*, is by no means clear. Here the problem is complicated in various ways. The saga itself is late, hardly older than the time of Chaucer in its present shape, and possibly dating from the early part of the fifteenth century. But Böðvar Bjarki, the hero whose exploits have suggested those of Beowulf, while probably historical, is a figure of considerable antiquity, not,

¹ Certain problems considered in the following pages were discussed very briefly in a paper read at the meeting of the Modern Language Association at Princeton University, in December, 1908.

² Cf. Kittredge, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, vol. VIII, pp. 227 ff.

like Grettir and Orm, a person of the later saga-period. He was in the service of Hrolf Kraki, the Hrothulf of *Beowulf*, who reigned, like Hrothgar, at Leire in Zealand. These, and other considerations, have led to the conjecture that the relation between the story of Bjarki and *Beowulf* may date from very early times, and that such discrepancies as appear may be due to independent developments in the saga itself. Elaborate theories of the early history of the material in *Beowulf* have even been constructed on this foundation, and the whole matter has been frequently discussed, ever since the full importance of Scandinavian tradition in the evolution of the poem has been generally recognized. It is the aim of the present paper to review this problem, in regard to which there seems to be little agreement among scholars, and attempt to place it in a somewhat clearer light.

The subject is important quite as much because it brings up other unsolved questions as for its own sake. The criticism of *Beowulf* is a tangled thicket, and whoever would make a clearing at a given point, and try to gain a wider view into the distance, must expect to find that there are more trees to be felled than he had supposed, and that the only path which lies open to him may be blocked by a monarch of the forest. The enormous amount of critical literature, too, offers fresh obstacles, by reason of its very bulk, to a clear comprehension of the epic, and everyone knows how tenacious parasitic growths may be. Beginning with the more specialized investigation, then, we shall find that questions of greater weight will demand a hearing, the most important one being how far the material may rest on a mythological basis, and how far the determination of these mythological elements is possible.

I.

Similarities of incident between the Anglo-Saxon epic and the *Hrólfs saga Kraka* were first observed, apparently, by Gisli Brynjulfson in 1857.¹ Until very recently, the opinion that these are not the result of chance has been almost universal, although there has been little agreement as to their exact significance.² It is hardly possible to classify critical opinion satisfactorily; it is too much complicated by other theories. Bugge and Sarrazin have been the chief champions of a common early source, and ten Brink was perhaps the most distinguished advocate of the hypothesis of late influence of the developed Beowulf-story upon the Scandinavian saga. Earlier discussions of the matter are of less importance, since they did not take into account the evidence of the *Bjarkarímur*. This material, first published by Finnur Jónsson in 1904, gives most important testimony for the adventures of Hrolf and his heroes. Any investigation which neglects it can carry but little weight. Partly on this evidence, and partly on other grounds, Axel Olrik, in the most distinguished contribution to Germanic saga which has appeared for many years, has

¹ *Antiq. Tidsk.*, 1852-3, p. 130, cf. Bugge, below.

² Consult Müllenhoff, *Beowulf*, Berl., 1889, pp. 55 ff.; ten Brink, *Beowulf*, Strassburg, 1888, pp. 185 ff.; Symons, *Germ. Heldensage*, Strassburg, 1889, p. 44, and Paul's *Grundriss*, vol. III, p. 649; Symons' views have been taken from the later work, "Züge aus dem anglischen mythus von Béaw-Biar . . . wurden auf den dänischen sagenhelden (Böðvarr-)Bjarki, durch Ähnlichkeit der Namen veranlasst, übertragen"; Boer, *Die Beowulf-sage*, *Arkiv f. nord. Filol.*, vol. XIX, pp. 45 ff., cf. esp. pp. 47 ff.; Kluge, *Eng. Studien*, vol. XXII, p. 144; Bugge, Paul-Braune *Beiträge*, vol. XII, pp. 55 ff., cf. note in Grundtvig, *Danmarks gamle Folkeviser*, III, p. 801; Sarrazin, *Anglia*, vol. IX, pp. 195 ff., *Eng. Studien*, vol. XVI, pp. 71 ff., vol. XXIII, pp. 242 ff., and vol. XXXV, pp. 19 ff., also his *Beowulf-Studien*, Berl., 1888, pp. 13 ff. References to Paul's *Grundriss* in the present paper are always to the second edition.

recently denied¹ that the fight with the monster at the court of Hrolf Kraki really affords a parallel to *Beowulf*—"neither Beowulf's wrestling match in the hall, nor in the fen, nor his contest with the fire-drake have any real identity [*i. e.*, with the passage in the saga]; but when one take a little of all of them, one can get a sort of similarity to the latest and poorest form of the Bjarki-saga." One might be inclined to accept the verdict of so learned an authority without question, were it not that Finnur Jónsson, in his edition of the saga and the *rímur*, has reaffirmed his belief in this connection, observing that "the hall-attacking monster is nothing else than a reminiscence of Grendel in *Beowulf*, though altered and faded."² Heusler, too, while recognizing fully the value of Olrik's contribution to the question, thinks that even admitting some of his contentions, one may disagree with his conclusion, and that the similarity of the motive to that in *Beowulf* is probably not the result of chance.³

¹ *Danmarks Heltedigtning*, Köb., 1903, vol. I, p. 135.

² *Hrólfs saga kraka og Bjarkarímur*, udgivne for samfund til udgivelse af gammel nordisk litteratur, Köb., 1904. Cf. p. xxii. In his *Oldnorske og Oldislandske Litteraturs Historie* (1898) he called it "en rigtignok svag afglans af det fra Bjovulf bekendte Grendelsagn," vol. II, p. 832.

³ Heusler's reviews of Olrik are to be found in *Anz. für deutsches Altertum*, vol. XXX, pp. 26-36; *Zts. für deutsches Altertum*, vol. XXXVI (NF), pp. 57-87. It is perhaps worth while to give Heusler's comment in full: "Die frage nach dem zusammenhang von Béowulf-Biár-Biarki behandelt O. s. 134 ff., 244. 248 behutsam und einleuchtend. Nur wenn, nach ausweis der Biarkarímur, der bär an die stelle des geflügelten ungeheuers tritt, und wenn man das bluttrinken Hialtis als die spitze der erzählung gelten lässt, bleibt ein zusammengesetztes motiv übrig: 'ein held kommt von Schweden (Gautland) an den Dänenhof und tötet ein ungetüm, das durch sein nächtliches erscheinen die hofmannen in schrecken hält'—ein motiv, dessen ähnlichkeit mit dem von Béowulf doch wol über den zufall hinausgeht. Und dann wird man es nicht ganz abweisen, dass der name Biarki (= Bericho) den etymologisch unverwanten, aber ähnlich klingenden namen Biár (= Béaw) angezogen habe, und dass dadurch der Rolfskämpe Biarki inhaber jenes fabulösen abenteuers wurde."—*Anz.*, *loc. cit.*, p. 32.

Apart from these important expressions of opinion, the reviews of Olrik's book which have thus far appeared do not indicate the attitude taken by scholars towards this sweeping denial of what had been considered a well-established relationship between Beowulf and Bōðvar. Reviews by Ranisch¹ and Mogk² do not discuss it. Mogk had expressed himself, in the same year that Olrik's book was published, as believing that the *Bōðvarsðáttir* in the saga might be considered "a werewolf-myth, into which the Grendel-motive of Beowulf is woven."³ Various authorities have continued to treat the connection between the two stories as an established or probable fact. Sarrazin, in a recently published monograph in *Englische Studien*, holds to his earlier view, which Mr. Chadwick, in the new *Cambridge History of English Literature*, seems inclined to accept.⁴ Brandl does not express a very decided opinion, although he seems to regard the relationship as doubtful.⁵ Gering, in his translation of *Beowulf* (1906), speaks of the "unverkennbare Ähnlichkeit" between the Grendel story and the saga of Bōðvar Bjarki.

Under these circumstances, it is difficult for the unprejudiced investigator to make up his mind, and there is nothing left for him to do but to go to the sources, and work the problem out for himself. The subject is not an easy one, and a careful study of its complications and due allowance for them are necessary if the results are to be of any value. We cannot judge of the relations of these different narratives by looking at them as they stand; their history and transmutations must be taken carefully into account. Whatever position one assumes, he must be deeply

¹ *Arkiv*, vol. XXI, p. 276.

² *Zts. für Volkskunde*, vol. XIV, p. 250.

³ Paul's *Grundriss*, vol. II, p. 842.

⁴ Vol. I (1907), p. 29.

⁵ Paul's *Grundriss*, vol. II, p. 993.

indebted to the researches of Olrik, as the present paper sufficiently shows. Grasp of a multitude of complicated details and rare psychological insight make his book a very noteworthy contribution to Germanic saga. As regards the study which follows, the writer feels that its chief value is not so much to prove a series of theses as to restate and criticise certain debatable matters, giving important passages in the texts and indicating bibliography and the general trend of scholarly opinion in such a way that the reader may form an intelligent judgment of his own.

II.

Let us first consider the passage in the *Hrólfs saga* in which the resemblances to *Beowulf* have been thought to lie.¹ It will be recalled that Bjarki is the son of Bjorn, and the grandson of king Hring of Uppdalir. He has just come to the court of king Hrolf Kraki at Hleidargard, or Lethra, in Denmark. On his way he has taken refuge for the night in the house of a peasant. The good-wife has told him that her son Hött is made the sport of the men at court, and begged that Bjarki will be kind to him. Arrived at the hall, Bjarki takes Hött, an abject coward, under his protection. During the evening meal the champions of Hrolf amuse themselves by throwing bones at Bjarki and Hött.

¹The *Hrólfs saga* has been edited by Rafn, *Fornaldarsögur*, Cop., 1829, vol. 1; by V. A'smundarson, F. A. S., Reykjavik, 1891, vol. 1; by Finnur Jónsson, Cop., 1904. Danish translation by Rafn, *Nordiske Kæmpe-Historier*, Cop., 1821, vol. 1. There is an excellent German translation by P. Herrmann, *Die Geschichte von Hrolf Kraki*, Torgau, 1905. This contains much useful supplementary material; parallel passages from related sources, etc. For further bibliography consult Herrmann, p. 4. The above rendering is based on Jónsson's text; but I have followed Herrmann's example in not keeping the present tenses, which interchange with the preterits in a way disturbing to narrative in modern English.

Bjarki hurls back a bone, and kills one of the king's men. The affair is ultimately settled, and Böðvar Bjarki becomes a retainer of the king.

And as the Yule-feast approached, the men grew depressed. Böðvar asked Hött the reason; he told him that a beast had already come two successive winters, a great and terrible one,—“and it has wings on its back and flies about continually; two autumns it has already sought us here, and it does great damage; no weapon wounds it, but the king's champions, the best warriors of all, don't come home at this time.” Böðvar said, “The hall isn't so well defended as I thought, if a beast can destroy the domain and property of the king.” Hött answered, “That is no beast, it is rather the greatest of monsters.” (*þat er ekki dýr, heldr er þat hit mesta troll*). Now came the Yule-even; and the king said, “Now I desire that the men be still and quiet in the night, and I forbid them all to run any risk on account of the beast; let the cattle fare as fate wills (*sem auðnar*); my men I do not wish to lose.” All promised to act as the king commanded. But Böðvar crept secretly out in the night; he made Hött go with him, but Hött only went because he was forced to, crying out that it would surely be the death of him. Böðvar told him it would turn out better. They went out of the hall, and Böðvar had to carry him, so full of fear was he. Now they saw the beast, and Hött shrieked as loud as he could, and cried that the beast was going to swallow him. Böðvar commanded the dog (*bikkjuna hans*, i. e. Hött) to keep still, and threw him down in the moss, and there he lay in unspeakable terror, and didn't even dare to run home. Then Böðvar attacked the beast, but it chanced that the sword stuck in the sheath when he wanted to draw it; then he pulled so hard at the sword that it flew out of the sheath, and he plunged (*leggr*) it immediately with such force under the shoulder of the beast, that it penetrated the heart, and hard and heavily fell the beast down on the ground dead. Then Böðvar went over to where Hött was lying. He took him up and carried him over to the place where the beast lay dead. Hött trembled frightfully. Böðvar said, “Now you must drink the blood of the beast.” For a long time he was loth to do this, but he finally didn't dare to do otherwise. Böðvar made him drink two big gulps, and eat some of the beast's heart; then Böðvar grappled with him, and they struggled long with each other. Böðvar said, “Now you have become very strong, and I don't believe that you will be afraid of the troop of King Hrolf any longer.” Hött answered, “I shall not fear them any more, nor shall I be afraid of you henceforth.” “That is well, comrade Hött,” [said Böðvar] “and now will we set up the beast, and arrange it so that the others will think it alive.” They did so. Then they went in and were quiet; no one knew what they had done.

The king asked in the morning whether they knew anything of the beast ; whether it had showed itself anywhere in the night ; they told him the cattle were all safe and sound in the folds. The king bade his men see if they couldn't find any indication that it had come thither. The warders obeyed, came quickly back again and told the king that the beast was advancing rapidly to attack the town (borginn). The king bade his men be courageous, [and said] each one should help, according as he had courage for it, and proceed against this monster. It was done as the king commanded ; they made themselves ready for it. The king looked at the beast and said, " I don't see that the beast moves ; but who will undertake the task and attack it ? " Böðvar answered, " A brave man might be able to satisfy his curiosity about this ! (pat væri næsta hrausts manns forvitnis-bót.) Comrade Hött, destroy this evil talk about you,—men say that there is neither strength nor courage in you ; go up and kill the beast !—you see nobody else wants to." " Yes," said Hött, " I will undertake it." The king said, " I don't know whence this courage has come to you, Hött, you have changed marvellously in a short time." Hött said, " Give me your sword Gullinhjalti, which you are bearing, and I will kill the beast or die in the attempt." King Hrolf said, " This sword can only be borne by a man who is both brave and daring." Hött answered, " You shall be convinced that I am such a man." The king said, " Who knows whether your character hasn't changed more than appearances show ? Take the sword and may you have good fortune ! " Then Hött attacked the beast and struck at it as soon as he was near enough so that he could hit it, and the beast fell down dead. Böðvar said, " Look, lord, what he has done ! " The king replied, " Truly he has changed much, but Hött alone didn't kill the beast, you were the man who did it." Böðvar said, " It may be so." The king said, " I knew as soon as you came here that only few men could compare with you, but this seems to me your most illustrious deed, that you have made a warrior out of Hött, who appeared little born to great good fortune. And now I wish him called Hött no longer, he shall from this day be named Hjalti,—thou shalt be called after the sword Gullinhjalti." ¹

Truly, a strange mingling of comedy and mock-heroics ! The *Hrólfssaga* indeed bears its character and history written large upon it. Incongruous and inharmonious elements have been added to a good old heroic story, and not always well worked into the narrative, so that contradictions and inconsistencies often appear. The tendency to exaggeration,

¹ Jónsson, *Hrólfssaga*, pp. 68 ff. ; Herrmann, pp. 73 ff.

the love of the fantastic, so characteristic of later saga-literature, are frequently visible. According to the most recent editor, the present form of the work can hardly be older than the first half of the fifteenth century.¹ Consequently, conclusions in regard to the history of Hrolf and his men can be drawn from this source only when strongly supported by earlier evidence. The propping-up and killing of the dead beast, a motive not found elsewhere in the story at this point, is a good instance of the bungling insertions of the redactor or redactors. Of course it destroys the whole effect of the scene, reducing the courage-motive to mere farce. So, too, the exaggerated low-comedy element in the character of Hjalti. There can be little doubt that he was in the beginning a heroic figure,—Olrik believes him to have been created by the poet of the *Bjarkamöl*, as an incarnation of the fidelity of the warriors of Hrolf.² Bjarki's visit to the peasant's house and the defence of Hött-Hjalti in the hall are the work of later times. It might not be necessary to emphasize this, were it not for the fact that much criticism does not take it sufficiently into account. The strength and prowess of Hjalti, rendering him able to stand beside Bjarki in heroism, were explained by the blood-drinking episode, probably pretty early in the history of the tale, but this does not mean that in the previous form of the story Hjalti was necessarily conceived as a coward before the blood-drinking took place. Mighty heroes did not disdain to increase their courage and strength by such draughts. In this very saga and in the *rímur*, Bjarki gains fresh vigor by his own brother's blood. Elgfrodi is half beast, half man. Hadding, at the direction of Odin, got renewed might by

¹ Cf. Jónsson's Introduction, esp. pp. xxvi ff. See also his *Oldnorske og Oldislandske Litteraturs Historie*, vol. II, pp. 829 ff., and Mogk, Paul's *Grundriss*, vol. II (2nd ed.), pp. 841 ff.

² *Helteedigtning*, p. 69.

drinking the blood of a lion, as Saxo relates in his first book. Neither Bjarki nor Hadding was a coward before this occurrence, of course; on the contrary, it is expressly stated that both were valiant from their youth up. The saga has gone furthest in degrading and trivializing the character of Hjalti in these earlier scenes, just as it alone has mistaken his nickname Hött for his true name, and made his real name Hjalti a mere appellation bestowed as a reward for bravery.

For an earlier form of the narrative in the saga we must look at the *rímur* and Saxo. A comparison with the *rímur* is of particular significance, since it shows pretty clearly the nature of some of the additions made by the saga. Only recently, as has already been said, have these verses been placed at the disposal of scholars, through Jónsson's edition. He dates them "in round figures" at 1400, if indications of style and language are to be trusted. They belong to the earliest group of *rímur*, and in content are close to the *Skjöldungasaga* in the Arngrim form. The two passages which are of especial interest in the present discussion are here given.¹

Most of the men insulted Hjalti; he was not clever in speech. One day they (Bjarki and Hjalti) went out of the hall, so that the king's men did not know of it. Hjalti was afraid, and cried, "Let us not go near this wood; there is a she-wolf here, which eats men; she will soon kill us both." The she-wolf burst out of a thicket, frightful, with gaping jaws. Hjalti thought this terrible; his legs and all his limbs trembled. Undaunted Bjarki advanced upon her, struck deep with his axe; fearful blood streamed from the she-wolf. "Between two things," said Böðvar, "shall you choose, Hjalti,—drink this blood, or I will kill you, no courage seems to be in you." Angrily answered Hjalti, "I don't dare to drink blood; (but) it is best to do it if I must; now I have no better choice." He lay down to drink the blood; then he drank three swallows,—enough for fighting with one man! His courage increased, his strength waxed, he became

¹ Jónsson, *Hrólfs saga kraka og Bjarkarímur*, esp. pp. xxviii ff.

very strong, mighty as a troll, all his clothes burst open. So he became courageous at heart, he feared not the flight of steel, the name of coward he feared no more, he was equal to Böðvar in courage. (IV, 58-66.)¹

He (Hjalti) has gained a brave heart and a courageous disposition ; he has got strength and valor from the blood of the she-wolf. The folds at Hleidargard were attacked by a gray bear ; many such beasts were there far and wide thereabout. Bjarki was told that it had killed the herdsmen's dogs ; it was not much used to contending with men. (?) Hrolf and all his men prepared to hunt the bear—"he shall be greatest in my hall, who faces the beast !" Roaring the bear ran from its lair and shook its baleful paws, so that the men fled. Hjalti looked on when the combat began ; he had nothing in his hands. Hrolf tossed to Hjalti his sword ; the warrior stretched forth his hand and grasped it. Then he plunged it into the bear's right shoulder, and the bear fell down dead. That was his first heroic deed, many others followed ; his heart was ever brave in the battle. From this exploit he got the name of Hjalti the brave, and was the equal of Bjarki. (V, 4-13.)²

In commenting on this episode, Jónsson says : "If we inquire what is most original here, there is really, as the evidence stands (i og for sig), scarcely any doubt that the *rímur* have made two beasts (the she-wolf and the gray bear) out of one, so that the saga may be held to have better preserved the original in this regard. This is strongly supported by the consideration that the monster which attacks the hall is nothing else than a reminiscence of Grendel in Beowulf, though altered and faded. But this shows the saga's superiority over the *rímur* in this regard."³ We can agree with Jónsson that the *rímur* represent a further development of the story in that they present two beasts where the other sources have one, but not that the

¹ Jónsson, pp. 139-140, Herrmann, p. 73.

² Jónsson, pp. 141-142, Herrmann, p. 75. These two passages are paraphrased by Olrik, *Heltedigtning*, pp. 116-117. Indeed, it is best not to attempt to render the elaborate rhymes and repetitions of the original too literally, cf. Herrmann's note, p. 2. The sense is occasionally obscure, and the ms. defective.

³ *Hrólfs saga*, etc., p. xxii.

saga shows the monster in an earlier form than the *rímur*. It looks as though the fight with the gray bear, given in the *rímur* to Hjalti, had originally belonged to Bjarki, and as though this shift had given rise to a second combat, the one with the she-wolf, introduced for the purpose of motivating the courage of Hjalti. That the bear-fight is the original one, and that it was fought by Bjarki, is shown by the account in Saxo.

After relating Bjarki's defence of Hjalti (Hjalto) in the hall of Rolf, at the bridal banquet of Agnar and Rute, Rolf's sister, and the duel between Biarco and Agnar, resulting in the latter's death, Saxo continues: "*Talibus operum meritis exultanti nouam de se siluestris fera victoriam prebuit. Ursum quippe eximie magnitudinis obuium sibi inter dumeta factum iaculo confecit, comitemque suum Ialtonem, quo uiribus maior euaderet, applicato ore egestum belue cruorem haurire iussit. Creditum namque erat, hoc pocionis genere corporei roboris incrementa prestari.*"¹ By these valorous achievements Biarco gained intimacy with the chief men of the court, and himself received Rute as a bride.

When Jónsson says that the monster in the saga represents a more original form of the story, it is impossible to agree with him. Olrik has shown beyond question, it seems to me, that the winged troll is a special late elaboration peculiar to the *Hrólfs saga*. For the details of this argument the reader is referred to Olrik's pages.² But the probabilities are so overwhelmingly in its favor that it really needs little proof. The troll is only found in "the latest and poorest form of the Bjarki-story," while the earlier and more archaic versions represent the contest as with a

¹ Saxo, ed. Holder, Strassburg, 1886, p. 56.

² *Heltedigtning*, pp. 116 ff., pp. 134 ff.

bear or wolf. There seems to be no reason to dissent from the general theory of the priority of this material in Danish. Olrik has, to be sure, been criticised for attaching undue importance to Saxo and the Danish versions of the Hrolf-story in contradistinction to those in Icelandic.¹ There is no need of raising this issue here; it seems altogether likely that the version in Saxo, as far as it goes, embodies the earlier form. But I see no reason to conclude that this was all of the episode as it was known to the Danes. There has been a good deal of discussion as to whether the blood-drinking is the "point" of the incident or not, whether it was an original feature or a secondary development.² Olrik holds the former view, believing that "the Danish saga is solely and only built up on the motive of drinking the blood of a wild beast." This was doubtless the part of the story which interested Saxo most, and I believe that there is no doubt that it had its origin in the common superstition that one gets the characteristics of an animal by drinking its blood or eating its flesh, but there seems to be evidence that the bear-fight existed as a saga-episode before the blood-drinking motive was added, that we may have here an old adventure of Bjarki's, originally not connected with the fortunes of Hjalti, which has been utilized to motivate the latter's courage.

Saxo expressly states that this incident gave Biarco fresh renown: "novam uictoriam prebuit," and continues, after relating it, "His facinorum uirtutibus clarissimas optimatum familiaritates adeptus," etc. Although he gives no

¹ Cf. Jónsson, *Hrólfs saga*, etc., p. xxvii.

² Cf. Boer, *Archiv*, vol. XIX, p. 52, "Ganz willkürlich ist schliesslich die annahme, der zug, dass Bjarki Hötr-Hjalti das blut des bären trinken lasst, sei in der dänischen sage die pointe der erzählung. . . . Mit gleichem rechte kann man solchen behauptungen gegenüber vollständig entgegengesetzte axiomata aufstellen."

details, his narrative is, as far as one can see, quite as much designed to illustrate the valor of Bjarki as to explain the courage of Hjalti. We must surely be careful to avoid concluding that Saxo necessarily gives the whole of the story. Heusler has noted, in another connection, that little reliance can be placed in the argument that because material is not fully given in Saxo it presumably did not exist in Danish. "*Schlüsse ex silentio sind überhaupt bei Saxo gefährlicher als bei den meisten andern sagendenkmälern : wie der sammler der þidrekssaga, so steht Saxo ausserhalb des stromes der vertrauten heimischen sagenkunde und sammelt emsig, was ihm der strom an sein ufer treibt. Vollständigkeit darf man bei ihm nirgends von vornherein erwarten.*"¹ Saxo is of course often allusive where Icelandic versions are detailed. Jónsson points out that Icelandic tradition is much richer and without doubt more representative of early forms (*alderdomsagtig*) and more genuine in regard to its whole constitution than Saxo's. We may, then, have to infer the fuller form of the story by observing the Icelandic monuments, making of course all due allowances. Olrik calls attention to the fact that Müllenhoff decided for the same interpretation which he favors. It is worth observing, however, that Müllenhoff admitted that the blood-drinking motive might be secondary, "*dies könnte ja allerdings eine spätere veränderung einer alten fabel sein.*"² It is impossible to do Müllenhoff's discussion justice without reading it in full; and it is too much complicated by other theories to make a review advisable here.

A further piece of evidence tends to confirm the view that the bear-killing was an older exploit of Bjarki's, originally

¹ *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, vol. XXXVI, (NF), p. 62. Italics are mine.

² *Beowulf*, Berlin, 1889, p. 55.

unconnected with the blood-drinking. Dr. Max Deutschein has recently pointed out what he thinks to be an early form of this in the Hereward-saga.¹ It may be worth while to examine this parallel somewhat in detail. The *Gesta Herwardi* deserves more careful attention from the student of early Germanic saga than it has hitherto received. The statement of the writer that he had seen some of the companions of Hereward, which there seems no good reason to doubt, places its composition in the early twelfth century.² The presence of Scandinavian elements in the story is unmistakable,—indeed, we have in this very passage a direct reference, “ad fabulam Danorum.” Hereward, an exile from his home, comes to the court of a Northumbrian potentate, where he gains renown by killing an enormous bear.

QUALITER MAXIMUM URSUM HERWARDUS INTERFECIT, UNDE LOCUM
CUM MILITIBUS UBI MANEBAT PROMERUIT.

Quod ubi quidam Gisebritus de Gant comperit, scilicet expulsionem ejus, pro illo misit, filiulus enim erat divitis illius; et profectus ultra Northumberland ad eum pervenit, solus ex propria provincia et paterna hereditate, cum solo servo Martino, cui cognomen erat Levipes, ubi non multis commoranti diebus quiddam laudabile contingit. Mos autem illi diviti fuit in Pascha, in Pentecosten, et in Natale Domini, ex claustris eductis saevis feris juvenum vires et animos temptare, qui militare cingulum expectabant et arma. Cum quibus Herwardus in primordio sui adventus, videlicet in Natale Domini, associatus, rogavit sibi unum e feris aggredi licere, aut saltem illum maximum ursum qui aderat, quem inclyti ursi Norweyæ fuisse filium, ac formatum secundum pedes illius et caput ad fabulam Danorum affirmabant sensum humanum habentem, et loquelam hominis intelligentem et doctum ad bellum; ejus igitur pater in silvis fertur puellam rapuisse, et ex ea Biernum regem Norweyæ genuisse; nec

¹ *Studien zur Sagengeschichte Englands*, I, pp. 249 ff. Cöthen, 1906.

² Printed in Gaimar, *Lestorie des Engles*, ed. Hardy and Martin, London, 1888, vol. I, pp. 339 ff. This is a more accurate text than those of Bright and Michel, (cf. *Introd.*, p. xlvii). For general criticism, cf. *Introd.*, p. lii f. The passage here reproduced will be found on pp. 343-4.

obtinere potuit, domino illius magnanimitatem juvenis percipiente, et pubertatem ejus pertimescente. Altera autem die bestia ruptis vinculis ex obscuratis claustris prorupit, omne dilanians et interficiens vivum quod consequi potuit. Mox autem, ut dominus rem comperit, milites præparare se et illum cum lanceis aggredi jubet, nisi mortuum capi non posse adjungens. Interim Herwardus feram cruentatum ad thalamum domini sui propter voces trepidantium revertentem, ubi uxor illius et filiae ac mulieres timide confugerant, obvium habuit, ac in illum confestim irruere voluit; ipsum iste prævenit, gladium per caput et ad scapulas usque configens, atque ibi spatam relinquens, bestiam in ulnis accepit, et ad insequentes tetendit. Quo viso plurimum mirati sunt. Unde non minimam gratiam apud dominum et dominam suam promeruit, et grave odium et invidiam cum militibus et pueris domus. Hujus ergo rei gratia locum et honorem cum militibus obtinuit; licet tunc militem fieri distulerit, dicens melius se virtutem et animum suum probare debere.¹

We have here, as Deutschbein notes, a form of the widespread story of the maiden who meets a bear in the forest, and bears him a son, who later becomes a hero with bear-characteristics. This turns up early in the story of Siward, told in a Latin chronicle of the twelfth century; is found in Saxo, Book X, where it is narrated of Thrugillus Sprageleg, whose grandson was Sven Estrithson; and finally, it got into Icelandic, and was made to explain the parentage of Bjarki. The whole development has been brilliantly investigated by Olrik, who sums up the result of his more detailed researches in a page or two of the *Helteðigtning*. In Saxo the bear's amour ends tragically; the shepherds find their flocks plundered, and then a bear-hunt is instituted. They surround him with nets, and dispatch him with spears. So in the *Hrólfs saga* (Cap. 20) and the *rímur* (II, 27 ff.), the father of Bjarki, forced to assume bear-shape by evil magic arts, is hunted down and killed by the warriors of the court,

¹It is interesting to note, in passing, that the women and girls made songs in his honor, "mulieres ac puellæ de eo in choris canebant,"—an incident for the attention of students of the development of popular poetry.

which is a little like the scene in the Hereward-saga. There the motivation is different. The nobleman of Northumbria has kept this beast, along with a select menagerie of others, in order to test the valor of the youth of his company; the gigantic animal breaks out accidentally, and is overcome by Hereward. The general situation is much like that in the Bjarki-story at this point; the young hero gets renown and a distinguished place at court by killing an enormous bear. Note that this takes place at Yule-tide (in Natale Domini), as in the *Hrólfs saga*. There is no mention of any blood-test. The hero has a servant Martin or Lightfoot, who may possibly be an adumbration of Hjalti.¹

Deutschbein points out further correspondences between the Hereward-story and the saga of Bjarki, especially in connection with the latter's fight with Agnar and marriage with Rute. He concludes: "In den Hauptzügen kommen sich also Hereward- und Bjarki-Sage sehr nahe. . . . Wir dürfen daher wohl annehmen, dass uns in der Herwardsage noch die ältere Bjarkisage erhalten ist, deren von A. Olrik angesetzte ursprüngliche Form also tatsächlich belegt ist." Shall we assume that the killing of this man-bear in the *Gesta Herwardi* is a form of the same exploit which we are considering in the Bjarki-story? Deutschbein appears to think so; he calls attention to its similarity to the second passage in the *rímur*, which, as we have seen, probably belonged originally to Bjarki. The confusion of the material

¹Cf., on this general subject, Deutschbein, *loc. cit.*, Olrik, *Arkit*, vol. XIX, (1903) pp. 199 ff; and *Heltedigtning*, pp. 215 ff; for the Sivard-saga, Langebek, *Scriptores rerum danicarum medii aevi*, Hafniae 1774. vol. III, pp. 288 ff; for the account in Saxo, Holder, p. 345, cf. Herrmann, *Gesch. von Hrolf Kraki*, p. 52. The bear-father episode may be well seen in Cosquin, *Contes Pop. de la Lorraine*, vol. I, (Jean de l'Ours, etc.). The reference in Olrik's *Archiv* article to the bear's ears in the son, (shown in Hartland, *Legend of Perseus*, to be very wide-spread), should read *Legend of Perseus*, III, 24.

here, the fact that we are drawing conclusions from another story, the frequency of the were-wolf motive and of bear-fights in general, should make us cautious about drawing conclusions too confidently. There are many discrepancies between the story in the *Gesta* and the account in the *rímur*. But it seems undeniable that we have here evidence of an earlier form of the Bjarki-story before the blood-test was introduced, although we cannot depend upon it to show the original form of the tale in its purity.

It is certain that the blood-drinking must later have been regarded as an important part of the episode. The passages in Saxo and the Icelandic accounts are sufficient evidence of this. This was due, no doubt, to the growing interest in the fortunes of Hjalti. Just as Bjarki overshadowed the figure of his sovereign Hrolf, so Hjalti came in time to rival the popularity of his comrade in arms. Hence the tendency to give a personal history to a hero who was in the beginning a mere incarnation of heroic devotion.

Let us now return to the account in the *Hrólfssaga*. What is to be said of the confused resemblances to *Beowulf*, which have arrested the attention of so many scholars? These are not observable in the *rímur* or Saxo. Nor can the passage in the *Gesta Herwardi* be regarded as a parallel to *Beowulf*. If the Grendel-story were the foundation of the whole episode in the history of Bjarki, we should expect that early monuments would show this, and show it more plainly than the late and reworked *Hrólfssaga*. The most simple solution seems to be that we may have to do with late influence of *Beowulf* upon the *Hrólfssaga* alone. We know that the saga has gathered to itself much material from sources outside the heroic stories which it treats, and that its general tendency is towards elaboration, even at the expense of logic and propriety. We know that other Norse

material, dealing with Grettir and Orm Storolfsson, was affected by *Beowulf*, and consequently that *Beowulf* was known in Iceland in this later period, whatever its provenience may have been. It is easy to see how, in the present case, the situation in the *Hrólfs saga* might well have recalled that in the epic. Beowulf killed a troll which attacked the court of Hrothgar at Leire. Bjarki, also a visiting hero from another people, killed an enormous bear at the same place, the royal residence at Leire,¹ thereby winning honor at the hands of Hrothgar's nephew and successor Hrolf. It is hardly necessary to point out how closely Hrolf, or Hrothulf, and Hrothgar were associated in saga, the former assuming in the north a most prominent position, and falling heir to much of the glory of his predecessor. Evidence of their friendly relations in peace and war, before their later estrangement, is given in *Widsith* and *Beowulf*.² In this passage the saga is clearly expanding the simpler story of a bear-fight which we have seen in the earlier sources representing a more original form of the tale. A floating incident found in later saga-literature, the propping up and killing of the dead beast, has been inserted here, for example. So the redactor has been influenced by reminiscences of *Beowulf*, being careful, however, to keep the blood-drinking episode prominently before the reader. This affords a simple explanation for the main divergences in the saga from the story as we have elsewhere observed it. The beast has become a supernatural monster, menacing

¹ It is perhaps unnecessary to give references to the location of the hall Heorot, and its identity with the residence of Hrolf. Cf. Olrik, *Heltedigtning*, p. 16, where the fate of the hall foreshadowed in *Beowulf* ll. 81-85 is explained by the events at Hrolf's death; and O.'s general discussion, pp. 188 ff.

² Müllenhoff, *Beowulf*, p. 46, "Der ruhm Hrothgars (Hroars) ist in der nordischen sage auf seinen neffen Hrothulf (Hrolf Kraki) übergegangen."

the lives of the warriors in the hall, so terrible that the king forbids his men to attack it; the fight takes place at night; it is a deliberately planned encounter, not a chance meeting. From *Beowulf*, apparently, the saga has derived the sword-name Gullinhjalti, as Kluge suggested. With this we shall deal in detail presently. Certain discrepancies here, in which the saga corresponds neither to the *rímur* accounts or to the Grendel incident or to Saxo, have been counted against the theory of influence of *Beowulf* on this passage. Why do we have a winged monster killed by a sword in an episode otherwise recalling the Grendel-contest? The reason for this departure seems plain. The wrestling-match with Grendel, who, though vanquished, escapes to his lair, would give no opportunity for Hjalti to drink his blood, and such a wrestling-match does not afford so good a motivation for this method of increasing a man's courage as does a fight with weapons. So the facile redactor has here worked in the dragon, which appears as a troll, with wings on its back, flying about in the air. It must always be kept in mind that we are dealing with a late, conscious, and on the whole bungling and inartistic attempt to fix over an old story. It does not matter to the redactor that the qualities of a troll are perhaps not so desirable to acquire as those of a bear, any more than it matters that the beast-propping episode spoils the courage-scene. The whole passage is so inconsequent and absurd that it is hard to judge its changes in the same way as in most instances of literary influence. Minor differences, such as that the monster has ravaged two winters, at Yule-tide, instead of "twelf wintra tīd," are common enough in the passage of a story like this from one source to another, especially when the whole is complicated by confusion with another tale. It will be remembered that in the Hereward-saga, the bear-fight took place at Yule-tide. We cannot even be sure that the form of the Beowulf-story

which affected the *Grettissaga* and the *Flateyjarbók* and probably this tale as well was the same in all respects as the form with which we are familiar. It is reasonable enough to suppose that *Beowulf* may have lived on in Scandinavian territory, and that the Anglo-Saxon version may have developed differences, especially since the condition of the proper names indicates that it must have been in the possession of the Anglo-Saxons for a considerable time. Even on English soil, there may well have been variant versions. The old theory of ten Brink,¹ while a failure in accounting for the stylistic peculiarities of Anglo-Saxon narrative, was reasonable enough in some other ways. Incidentally it may be remarked that ten Brink's view of the relations of *Beowulf* and the *Hrólfs saga* was something like that proposed here.

There is no way, surely, of proving that there are reminiscences of *Beowulf* in the *Hrólfs saga* at this point. Certain resemblances there undeniably are. If one believes, with Olrik, that these are merely fortuitous, there is nothing more to be said. If one believes, with almost all other scholars, that this is not the case, it will be found, I believe, that the hypothesis advanced above offers a reasonable explanation of them.²

¹ For a criticism of ten Brink, cf. Boer, *Arkiv*, vol. XIX, pp. 50 ff. Boer's views seems too much affected by his theory of a dragon-myth to be impartial; cf. p. 58, "auch in Saxo's quelle war das ungetüm schon aller wahrscheinlichkeit nach ein fliegender drache; ein dem Grendel ähnlicher unhold wäre bei ihm unmöglich zu einem bären geworden," etc. Skeat, it will be remembered, advanced the theory that there was so much in the figure of Grendel to suggest a bear that this might explain his origin. (*Journal of Philology*, vol. XV, pp. 120 ff.)

² On this general subject, see Brandl's review of Olrik's destructive criticism of the parallel to the dragon fight in *Beowulf* afforded by an adventure of Frotho I, as related in Saxo's second book. This parallel, elaborated by Sievers, (*Ber. der Gesells. der Wiss. zu Leipzig*, vol. XLVII, pp. 175 ff.) has been generally accepted. Brandl defends it, in part, . . . "das Vorhand-

The development of this episode as it appears in the *Hrólfs saga* is, perhaps, of less moment in itself, but its bearings on the history of the material in *Beowulf* are important. It has been seen that while the contention of those who maintain that the blood-test is secondary may very likely be correct, it is, on the other hand, impossible to subscribe to such a theory as Bugge's. This was very explicitly stated, though not worked out in detail. Bugge held "that the similarity of the saga (i. e., to *Beowulf*), the scene of which is laid in virtually the same place, is not accidental, on the contrary I explain it on the ground that saga-incidents are attributed to Böðvar, which were earlier related in a Danish version out of which the English *Beowulf*-saga developed, and about a hero corresponding to the Anglo-Saxon *Beowulf*."¹ Heusler seems to hold a somewhat similar view, which we shall consider in a moment. If, however, while finding that the evidence does not support the hypothesis of an early connection, we recognize in the *Hrólfs saga* reminiscences taken from *Beowulf*, we have rather an interesting instance of familiarity with this material in Iceland in the later period in addition to the stories of Orm and Grettir. Possibly it was not in circulation in popular form at all. The *Hrólfs saga* certainly suggests bookish rather than oral sources at this point.²

ensein von Verschiedenheiten hebt die Beweiskraft der Übereinstimmungen nicht auf, gibt nur dem Nachahmer etwas von Originalität." (Paul's *Grundriss*, vol. II, p. 997). Note changes in the visualization of Grendel and his mother in the stories of Grettir and Orm. Or consider the variations in the shape and attributes of the monster in the Chapaluc or Cath Paluc legends (E. Freymond, *Artus' Kampf mit dem Katzenungetüm*, Halle, 1899, esp. pp. 45 ff.). There is much about the methods of the author of *Tristram de Nanteuil*, who worked over the old Chapalu motive, with such changes and elaborations as he saw fit, to remind one of the processes in the reshaping of the *Hrólfs saga*. (Freymond, pp. 26 ff.).

¹ Paul-Braune, *Beiträge*, vol. XII, p. 56.

² Boer, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, vol. XXX, p. 65, ascribes the *Beowulf* passage in the *Grettissaga* to a bookish person of the late thirteenth

III.

The sword Gullinhjalti used by Hött in the saga in sticking the dead troll, from which he gets the name Hjalti (according to the saga only) deserves some attention. Kluge was the first to call attention to the parallel between this sword and the old demonic weapon "gylden-hilt" which Beowulf found in the cave.¹ "Vielleicht war gyldenhilt eben der name jenes schwertes in besitz der Grendel, und der von Beowulf entführte rest des schwertes könnte dann ebensogut Gyldenhilt wie gylden hilt genannt sein. Natürlich müsste dann angenommen werden, dass der neue besitzer des Gyldenhilts die werthvolle hilze wieder zu einem schwerte vervollständigt hätte." Much has since been made of this by Sarrazin,² who argued that the dual character of Hött-Hjalti had developed out of swords in *Beowulf*. Personification of weapons, he thought, would lead naturally to the creation of a concrete figure in human form. The two swords are Hrunting, which fails Beowulf in the fight with the mother (= Hött), and the old sword found in the cave (= Hjalti). It is hardly necessary to repeat that the testimony of the *rímur*, which had probably not been accessible to Sarrazin, as well as that of Saxo, leaves no doubt as to the late development of the name Hött, and the fact that he was called Hjalti or Hialto *before* the blood-drinking.³ The

century, denying any proof here that the story was displaying an "unbewusste neigung" to attach itself to popular heroes. He admits the probability of its having been familiar in the north, however. He can see no force in the parallel in the Orm story. His arguments do not seem to have proved convincing,—both Olrik and Brandl speak of the latter as an analogue.

¹*Englische Studien*, vol. xxii, p. 145.

²*Neue Beowulf-Studien*, *ibid.*, vol. xxxv, pp. 19 ff. The article is dated Oct., 1904.

³It may be observed that Hrunting is expressly stated to be a good sword, *nāfre hit æt hilde ne-moac*, 1461, which does not suggest the charac-

naming of him Hjalti in the saga is, as Olrik points out, "only an invention of the saga-man." The *rímur* mention the incident thus: "Hér með fekk hann Hjalta nafn *hins hjartaprúða*, and as he is consistently called Hjalti before this, the adjective is clearly the important part of the name. In the *rímur*, the mother tells Bjarki that Hjalti is the name of her much-abused son, and mentions Hött as a name given him in derision (the hat) along with "horned pig" and "good-for nothing," (IV, 33 ff., cf. Jónsson, p. 136).¹ So Hött has been taken in the saga, which so often represents a further stage of development than the *rímur*, as his real

ter of Hött. It is no reproach to a sword if it cannot survive an attack on a supernatural creature when wielded by a mighty hand,—Beowulf's sword Naegling breaks in the dragon fight, (2680 ff). The bone-throwing contest is not much like the flyting with Hunferth. Sarrazin further equates Hjalti with Wiglaf, and says that the speeches of Wiglaf recall those of Hialto in Saxo Grammaticus, to which attention had been called by Bugge. Wiglaf's sword, too, has, according to Sarrazin, "gewissermassen" the function of the old demonic sword, which we have seen is, on his theory, to be equated with Hjalti. All these correspondences I confess myself unable to follow. The resemblance between these speeches has been admirably criticised by ten Brink as due to the formal character of Germanic poetry in a given situation, "Ähnlichkeit der Situation ruft Ähnlichkeit der Ausführung von selbst hervor. . . . Es muss in der germanischen Poesie eine Art Typus für die Fassung derartiger Reden gegeben haben, der trotz aller Variationen immer durchschimmerte." (*Beow.*, pp. 191-2). It will be shown presently that there does not appear to be any connection between the dragon-fight at the end of *Beowulf* and the fight at the end of the saga, in which a porcupine-troll plays a minor role.

¹ Jónsson seems to have misunderstood this point, cf. p. xxii, "Hertil skal föjast, at i rimerne (v, 5-14), er der endnu tale om en 'graabjorn,' der kommer og dræber Rolvs faar og kvæg i foldene; denne dræbes af Hjalte med et sværd, hvorved hann ogsaa fik sit tilnavn: Hjalte, og bliver nu hirdmand." This cannot be the case; the name which the king gives him is not Hjalti, but *hinn hjartaprúði*, a poetical variation of his appellation *hinn hugprúði* in other Icelandic monuments, cf. *Snorra Edda*, ed. Jónsson, Cop. 1900, p. 108. If the king were the first to bestow this name on him, his mother could not say "Átta eg son er Hjalti hét," etc. before the bear-killing.

name, and Hjalti merely as an appellation, just as in the course of time it was forgotten that Bjarki was the hero's true name and Bōðvar an appellation referring to his warlike disposition. The *Hrólfs saga* makes Bjarki a nickname,¹ as do Icelandic sources generally.²

In these etymological strivings of the saga-man we may very likely have a further instance of borrowing from *Beowulf* in this passage. Finding the sword *gylden-hilt* in the possession of Hrothgar, to whom it was given by Beowulf (properly only the hilt,—as Kluge says, we must assume that it was furnished with a new blade), he identified it with the sword of Hrolf, and on this basis explained what he supposed to be the secondary name Hjalti. It is possible, of course, that the occurrence of the same name “gold-hilt” in these two stories, a very appropriate epithet for a king's weapon, is due to mere chance.

Sarrazin has laid considerable stress on a later passage in the *Hrólfs saga*, considering it identical with the dragon-episode in *Beowulf*. “Bōðvar falls with his trusty companion Hött in a contest with a troll, from whose bristles arrows fly; Beowulf falls in a fight with a fire-spewing dragon, supported and avenged by his trusty companion Wiglaf.”³ Since the publication of his first series of *Beowulf-Studien* he has since insisted on the validity of this parallel,⁴ which he thinks important for the structure of the story and for its mythical significance,—“the Beowulf-saga would lose its mythical character if the dragon-fight were not originally a part of it,” a view which is no longer accepted, as we shall see presently. But the passage in the saga reveals nothing significant for the last adventure in *Beowulf*.

¹ Cf. Herrmann, note 12, p. 131.

² On the general subject of names cf. Olrik, pp. 137 ff.

³ *Beowulf-Studien*, 1888, p. 47.

⁴ *Englische Studien*, vol. XVI, p. 82; *ibid.*, XXIII, pp. 245 ff.

Böðvar, in bear-shape, has been aiding Hrolf in the struggle against Hjorvard. Hjalti exhorts him, not understanding the situation, to take part in the combat. The narrative continues :

After this exhortation of Hjalti's Böðvar arose and went into the battle, but the bear had vanished from King Hrolf's army, and now things began to go badly for them. For Queen Skulde, who was sitting in her black tent on a magic seat, could accomplish naught with her arts, so long as the bear was in King Hrolf's army. Now there came a change, like dark night after a clear day, and King Hrolf's men saw advancing from King Hjorvard's army a fearful boar not smaller in size than a heifer three years old. It was wolf-gray in color, and arrows flew from its bristles, and it killed in multitudes, in this strange fashion, King Hrolf's men. Böðvar Bjarki now struck out madly, and hewed both right and left, and thought of nothing else than to overcome as many men as possible before he should fall. One fell down right on top of another before him. Bloody were his arms up to the shoulders, and he piled up a heap of dead corpses round about him.¹

Nothing further is said of this porcupine-troll. Neither Böðvar nor Bjarki are said to fight it, nor that it kills either of them. It is in no way a fundamental part of the story ; on the contrary it has all the appearance of a late addition. It is merely an enchantment of Queen Skulde,—for a similar episode see the account of the boar-troll sent by the wizard-king Athils against Hrolf and his men earlier in the story. The whole setting of the incident is different from the situation in *Beowulf*.

IV.

The effort has frequently been made to establish a connection between *Bēowulf* and Böðvar Bjarki at an early period by means of *Bēowa*, the semi-divine figure to whom, according to time-honored scholarly tradition, the adventures of

¹ *Hrólfs saga*, Cap. xxxiii, Jónsson, p. 102.

Bēowulf earlier belonged. Etymological equations between Biár, the Scandinavian form of the name Bēowa, and Bjarki, are now rejected by the best authorities,—Brandl, Olrik, and Heusler, for example. The name Bjár occurs in an explanatory translation of Anglo-Saxon names in the *Langfeðgatál*. “Skjaldin er vér kǫllum Skjöld, hans son Béaf er vér kǫllum Bjár.” This is no proof of popular acquaintance with Biár as a Scandinavian figure; it is a bookish explanation of material derived from Anglo-Saxon sources. Nor can any important conclusion be drawn from the occurrence of the name in a list of warriors in the *Snorra Edda*, “Björn reið Blakki en Bjár Kerti.” Bēowa has no place in any northern version of the saga of the Scyldings, nor is there any evidence of his early presence there as a mythico-heroic figure.¹ Yet Symons has attached great weight to the quotation from the *Langfeðgatál*, which he says “builds the bridge” between Bēowa and Böðvar Bjarki.² The efforts of Boer to connect Bēowa with a hypothetical O. N. form *Beawr are not very convincing; one can do much with processes of this sort.³ Sarrazin’s equation Böðvar : Bēowa need not be dwelt on.⁴ Added to the other weaknesses in the equation Biár = Bjarki is the fact, which does not seem to have been sufficiently considered, that the name of the saga-hero always appears with the diminutive suffix *-ki*.

¹ For a general discussion of this matter, cf. Brandl, Paul’s *Grundriss*, vol. II, pp. 992 f., Olrik, p. 137 note, and p. 244 note; and Heusler, *Anzeiger*, vol. xxx, pp. 26 ff. The quantities of the vowels have been marked in this passage, in order to make the linguistic discussion perfectly clear; elsewhere the marks of length have been purposely omitted, save in some titles in Scandinavian.

² *Grundriss*, vol. III, p. 649.

³ *Arkiv*, vol. XIX, pp. 19 ff.

⁴ Cf. *Beowulf-Studien*, 1888, p. 47, and Holthausen’s review, *Literaturblatt*, 1890, No. 1, p. 15.

Heusler suggests that the similarity in sound between Bjarki and Biár might have been sufficient to effect a transference of the story, even though the names are not etymologically connected,—“und dann wird man es nicht ganz abweisen, dass der name Biarki (= Bericho) den etymologisch unverwanten, aber ähnlich klingenden namen Biár (= Béaw) angezogen habe, und dass dadurch der Rolfskämpe Biarki inhaber jenes fabulosen abenteuers wurde.” This brings us to a question of considerable importance,—whether we are to accept the old theory that the main adventures of the epic were earlier told of Beowa, and secondarily transferred to Beowulf. The bearings of this matter on other lines of investigation than the one at present under consideration are obvious,—mythology, for example, has rested much of its case on the activities of the old “god” Beowa, supposedly reflected in the epic in its present form, where the exploits are told as those of a mortal man. Careful discussion of all this, then, is well worth while.

This theory, proposed by Kemble, and accepted and elaborated by Müllenhoff,¹ has gained almost universal acceptance. The majority of scholars seem to regard it almost as a statement of fact, to be taken for granted in investigating the history of the poem. Sievers says, for example, “I may, I suppose, regard it as admitted that Beowulf the Geat was not originally the hero of the dragon-saga, but Beowulf the Scylding, the father of Healfdene, or rather the Scylding Beow or Beowa of the genealogies and place-names, whose name was secondarily supplanted in our epic by the name Beowulf.”² Brandl thinks that the original

¹ *Beowulf*, Berl., 1889, pp. 8 ff

² *Sitzungsberichte*, loc. cit., p. 181. Cf. the statements of Koegel, *Zeit. für deutsches Alt.*, xxxvii, pp. 268 ff.; Binz, Paul and Braune, *Beiträge*, vol. xx, pp. 153 ff.; Symons, *Grundriss*, iii, pp. 648 ff.

saga probably belonged to the mythical Beowa, whom he regards as a protecting agricultural hero.¹ Olrik puts the matter similarly, "for there is little doubt that the troll-fights of the Geat champion Beowulf, which stand in so foreign a relation to the historical saga-cycle of Hygelac and Hrothgar, originally belonged to the older Beov (Beowulf)."² A few scholars, Boer for instance,³ insist on a modification of Müllenhoff's hypothesis, while not dethroning Beowa from his important place in the development of the story. Expressions of disbelief, on the other hand, are rare. Gering states his position with great frankness, maintaining "that an old myth of a 'divine hero' Beowa, supposedly identical with Freyr, underlies the two narratives (in the epic), is an unproved hypothesis."⁴ Sarrazin has opposed the theory stoutly, but his criticisms have perhaps had less weight because the details of his general argument have so often failed to carry conviction. It is well to remember that "the artificial and improbable hypothesis of an early Anglo-Saxon Beowa-myth,"⁵ as he calls it, is hard to reconcile with the view, which has been more and more generally accepted in recent years, that the material in *Beowulf* is largely Scandinavian in its origin and development. Many scholars take a cautious attitude, and while not denying the validity of the theory that the tale was earlier told of Beowa, are hardly ready to accept it. Mr. Chadwick, writing for the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, believes it "of somewhat doubtful value."⁶ Professor C. G. Child puts the case with some vagueness. "It is perhaps safe to assume," he says, "that a god Beowa, whose existence in myth is certain, became confused

¹ *Grundriss*, II, p. 999.

² *Heltedigtning*, p. 246.

³ *Archiv*, XIX, pp. 28 ff.

⁴ *Beowulf*, Heidelberg, 1906, p. vii.

⁵ Cf. *Englische Studien*, vol. XVI, pp. 73 ff.

⁶ Vol. I, p. 31.

or blended with Beowulf.”¹ Nowhere, however, as far as I am aware, has the negative side of the case been plainly and fully stated.

It seems better to take recent discussions, especially those of Olrik, Brandl, Heusler, and Chadwick, as the starting-point for an examination of this theory, rather than earlier investigations. Müllenhoff was the chief apostle of this doctrine, but since his day the general situation in regard to the relationship and significance of the earlier figures in the genealogies of Danish and English monarchs has been placed in a much clearer light. Scaef and Beow or Beowa (Beowulf) who appear in the genealogies on English soil and in the epic as father and son of Scyld respectively,² apparently owe their position to the desire of the Anglo-Saxons to refer their monarchs to mighty heroes of poetry. In northern sources these relationships do not exist. Scaef has nothing to do with the Scylding genealogy,³ nor does Beowa have any place there. Beowulf, who appears in the epic as son of Scyld and father of Healfdene, is found in no other source as a Danish king. There is no evidence, then, of any original connection between Beowa and Scyld. Beowa is probably only a “guest” in the Scylding genealogy, having been put there by English singers. “They have included a popular hero in the most distinguished family they knew.”⁴

As has just been said, Olrik agrees with the majority of

¹ *Beowulf*, Cambridge, Mass., 1904, p. ix.

² Beowulf : Scyld Scefing—Beowulf—Healfdene.

A.S. Chronicle : Scaef Sceldwa—Beaw.

Aethelweard : Scef—Scyld—Beo.

Wm. of Malmesbury : Scaef—Sceldius—Beowius.

³ Olrik makes Scaef originally Scaefa, king of the Lombards in *Widsith*. This is denied by Chadwick and Heusler. See below, p. 259.

⁴ Cf. Olrik, pp. 239 ff., esp. p. 246.

other scholars in assigning Beowulf's troll-fights to Beowa, in the earlier stages of the story. "In England his [the older hero's] fight with Grendel plays a larger part than any other poetic motive: it furnishes a theme for the people's mightiest epic, and allusions in place-names are unusually clear. The contest with Grendel seems to have played as prominent a rôle in the English imagination as Sigurd Fafnisbane's dragon fight in Norway and Sweden." Olrik appears to forget that if *Beowulf* is the English people's mightiest epic, it is practically the only one extant. The "epics" of the Caedmon-Cynewulf schools are obviously not to be considered here. Since so little of heroic epic literature has survived, it is saying little to assert that the fight with Grendel looms larger than any other motive. The allusions in place-names, which Olrik considers "unusually clear," must be considered somewhat more in detail. It will be seen, I think, that they afford the slenderest of slender support for the hypothesis that Beowa once fought against the monster Grendel.

Many examples of the occurrence of the name Beowa have been collected from the Anglo-Saxon charters. They have been most fully set forth, perhaps, by Binz.¹ Manifestly they prove nothing as to Beowa's connection with the adventures of the poem, unless some relation can be established between them and figures of the Beowulf-saga. But, strangely enough, far-reaching conclusions have been drawn from isolated place-names compounded with the word Beowa in one of its shorter forms. Binz says, for example, "That the main part of the myth of Beowa, the fight with Grendel, uninfluenced by the figure of the historical Geat hero Beowulf, was current (*geläufig*) among the Anglo-Saxons at the time of the settlement in Britain, is shown

¹ Paul-Braune, *Beiträge*, vol. xx, pp. 155 ff.

by various place-names," Beas broc, Beasfeld, Beuesfel, Beoshelle, etc. But how do these prove any connection with the Grendel-fight? They prove nothing of the sort—only in one instance, the Wiltshire charter of the year 931, is there any case for a connection with the Beowulf-story.¹

This celebrated passage in the Wiltshire charter, in which the two names Grendel and Beowa occur in descriptions of localities at no great distance apart, certainly deserves careful attention. It has been more often discussed and referred to than quoted in full, and so the section which is of significance is here given. It does not seem worth while to reproduce the charter entire; the boundaries of the piece of land in question are in part as follows:

. ðonne norð ofer dune. ón meos h́linc weste weardne; ðonne á dune on ða yfre. on beowan hammes hecgan. on bremeles sceagan easte weardne; ðonne on ða blacan græfan. ðonne norð be ðem 7 heafdan. to ðære scortan dic. butan anan æcre; ðonne to fugel mere to ðan wege; ondlong weges. to ottes forda; ðonon to wudumere; ðonne to ðære ruwan hecgan; ðæt on langan hangran; ðonne on grendles mere; ðonon on dyrnan geat; ðonne eft on lin leage geat.,²

The combination *beowan hamm* and *grendles mere*, we are told, supports the theory that the Grendel story was narrated in England with Beowa as the hero. But does the appearance of two familiar figures in place-names in the

¹ Brandl points out that place-names are only of significance "wenn sie erst in einer zur sage stimmenden Relation auftreten" (*Archiv*, p. 152), and Symons, *Grundriss*, III, p. 650) recognizes that the testimony of the place-names, apart from the present passage, is "weniger entscheidend." For full reference to Brandl's article, cf. note, p. 263.

² Gray-Birch, *Cartularium Saxonum*, London, 1887, vol. II, p. 364. I have modernized the A.S. character for *w*.

same locality necessarily mean a connection between them? It will be observed that this is the only instance in the charters of the combination of these two names, as far as has hitherto been shown. But Binz reaches what he considers a sure conclusion. "This leads indisputably (mit Sicherheit) to the localization of the myth in Wiltshire, and makes it probable for the other localities,"—that is, those in which the above-mentioned place-names occur. The two figures do not occur in the same region by chance, he thinks, they are combined "in einer gewiss nicht zufälligen weise." Surely, this is reading a good deal into the passage. Why assume direct connection between the two? All that this proves is that an Anglo-Saxon hero familiar as having been elevated into the royal genealogies, has given his name to a locality not far from one bearing the name of Grendel. If there were several cases of such a connection we might begin to speak of relationship, but how do we know this is not the merest chance? In the same charter there is mention of a boar,¹—does that mean that an adventure with such a beast is to be attributed to the hero? Suppose one were to set up a theory that there is a saga-relation between Scyld and Bikki, and offered as proof the passage in the charter for the year 917,² in which there are mentioned, as in the same district, *scyldes treow*, and *bican sett*,² which Binz enumerates under the allusions to Bikki. How much weight would this carry?

There is more to be said in regard to this passage in the Wiltshire charter. Hitherto I have assumed, for the sake of argument, that the two places under discussion were named for the monster in the poem and the hero of the genealogies respectively. But it is quite possible that neither of these things is true. Miller's argument that the

¹ *to bares anstigon.*

² Gray-Birch, III, p. 84.

word *grendel* here is not a proper name at all, that it means "drain," has never, to my knowledge, been refuted.¹ Binz objected that this point is "nicht stichhaltig, da eben die genetivische bildung *grendles mere* im gegensatz zu den übrigen beispielen von composition den character als eigennamen deutlich erkennen lässt," but this is contradicted in an editorial note by Sievers, and even by one of Binz's own examples. Sievers says: "Auch nicht-eigennamen erscheinen ganz gewöhnlich im genetiv," *earnas hricg*, of *focgan igeðum*, *egesan treow*, etc.²

Again, *Beowan ham(m)* may have been a spot named, not for the hero Beowa, but for an ordinary mortal called after him. Heinzel made this suggestion in regard to *Beas broc*, and another entry in the charters mentioned by Müllenhoff, which has since been shown to rest on a textual misreading.³ Is it unreasonable to suppose that the name Beowa was borne by some individual who lived in this locality, which was called, from this fact, *Beowan ham(m)*?

¹ "There is an interesting approximation of the expressions *beowan hammes* and *grendles mere* in Cart. Sax., No. 677. The conjunction has been used as an argument to prove the local distribution of the Beowulf legend, and to found an historical generalisation.

I am induced by a recent reappearance of this argument to point out that *grendles* is not a proper name. The Charter has *fugel mere*, *wudu mere*, *grendles mere*. The word *grendel* stands alone in C. S. 1103, and *gryndeles sylle* occurs in C. S. 996. In the former it is the 'grindle,' i. e., drain—see note *ad loc.* and Halliwell. In the latter the sense is 'the grindle dirt-pond' (see Grein s. vv., *sol*, *sylian*) i. e., the dirty pond into which the drain runs (*fram gryndeles sylle to russemere*). Hence in C. S. we have a series *fugel mere* 'the bird-pool,' *wudu mere* 'the wood-pool,' *grendles mere* 'the cess-pool.' " (*Academy*, May, 1894, p. 396.)

² Binz, loc. cit., p. 157, note 3.

³ Cf. Heinzel, *Anzeiger*, vol. xvi, p. 267; ten Brink, *Beowulf*, p. 217, Anm. 2; Binz, p. 155. Binz objects to Heinzel's criticism of *Beas broc* on the ground that the strong inflectional form indicates a divine or mythic being. He refers to Kögel, *Zs für deutsches Alt.*, xxxvii, p. 272, who says "mannesnamen nach göttlichen wesen pflegen in schwacher form, aus kompositis verkürzt, aufzutreten."

The word *hām* is of course one which would be expected in such a connection. In the Northumbrian *Liber Vitae* there appears a certain Boduwar Berki among the benefactors of the church at Durham. He was clearly named after the Scandinavian hero. Why should not a similar thing have happened in Wiltshire? And in the north historical personages were named Sigurd.

So much for the evidence of place-names in the charters. It seems clear enough that they afford no proof that the Grendel-fight was originally attached to Beowa, or indeed that there was ever any connection between the old hero of the genealogies and the monster. We now come to the question why the name Beowulf occurs in the line of Danish kings in the poem in the place where Beowa might be expected.

The first thing to note is that this is found nowhere else than in the single extant MS. of the epic, and that there is no valid reason to suppose that this conception of a Beowulf as son of Scyld ever existed elsewhere than here. As far as the evidence goes, it points clearly to the conclusion that this introduction of a Beowulf here had no further circulation than that given it by the poem, and that it was never accepted extensively by learned or popular sources, if indeed it was ever accepted at all. This has been emphasized by Brandl. "Lediglich auf unser Epos beschränkt ist die Benennung Beowulf für den Beowa der Sage, und zwar in dessen beiden Rollen: als Sohn des Scild und als Bezwiner des Grendel. . . . Auch hat diese ganze Weiterbildung der Beowagestalt weder auf die Aufzeichnungen der Beowasage bei den ags. Chronisten des 10–12 Jahrhs. . . . einen Einfluss geübt, noch in den späteren Abschriften der wests. Königsgenealogie ein einziges Beowulf statt Beowa hervorgerufen. Sie kann daher, — lediglich vom Standpunkt der Ueberlieferung aus zu reden — erst vom

Dichter des Epos ersonnen und von den Lesern als seine individuelle Darstellung behandelt worden sein.”¹ Scholars have been inclined to attach too much weight to this passage in *Beowulf* as revealing an early and widely accepted conception of this genealogy. The father of Healfdene (Halfdan) in northern sources is Frodi, and there is no Beowulf in the Danish Scylding line, while such a loophole out of the difficulty as to assert “it is conceivable that Frodi and Beowulf are different names for the same person”² need hardly receive serious consideration.

The second point to be noted is that it is easy to account for the substitution of Beowulf for Beowa at this point without assuming that troll-fights were ever attributed to the latter. If we follow this hypothesis, we are asked to believe that the Beowulf-poet, or the persons to whom his activity is to be credited, made over a single demon-killer and genealogical hero into two separate figures, when the material received a new setting in Scandinavian scenery, and that this poet, in order to be entirely consistent, gave the new name Beowulf both to the Geat hero of the troll-fights and to the genealogical figure, now the grandfather of the king whose hall is purified. This is not very convincing. Under such circumstances, it would be more natural for the poet to endeavor to keep two such heroes, who had developed out of a single figure, distinctly separate from each other, by giving them different names.³ It is much more reasonable to suppose that such a similarity in the names of two different personages would have been

¹ *Grundriss*, loc. cit., p. 993.

² Chadwick, p. 146. Mr. Chadwick does not propose this as a solution, but merely as a possibility.

³ Brandl (p. 993) admits, “Für die Verständlichkeit der Erzählung war sie kein Vorteil; Sagen zeigen daher in der Regel das entgegengesetzte Bestreben, namensverwandte Gestalten zu vereinigen.”

allowed to stand in the poem if there had been no early identity between the two heroes. One can see that the poet might then have been misled by the likeness of Beowa to Beowulf in sound,—perhaps, as Brandl says, mistaking one for a shorter form of the other, as Alda for Aldburg, Eada for Eadburg,—and, not fearing any confusion between two characters as different as these, and otherwise entirely unconnected, might have given what he supposed to be the fuller form Beowulf to the hero Beowa. The situation as it stands points to this as the simplest solution. Let us arrange the matter schematically.

1. We know that Beowa was an Anglo-Saxon hero, who was elevated into the royal genealogies as the son of Scyld.

2. We do not know that he was ever the hero of troll-fights, save as far as the charters, etc., may show, and this evidence has been found inconclusive.

3. We have no indication that a Beowulf had a place in the royal line, save the testimony of the epic alone.

4. We do know that a Beowulf was the hero of the troll-fights.

In the face of these facts, it is arguing directly against the simplest conclusion to assert that Beowa probably was the original hero of the Grendel-episode, or that a Beowulf is to be accounted an early genealogical figure, except by confusion with the hero of the poem.

There is another possibility, which relieves the “Beowulf-poet” of the charge of introducing this rather confusing situation into the poem. The word Beowulf in ll. 18 and 53, the only places where it occurs as the name of the Danish king, may be a substitution by a redactor or scribe for Beowa, which stood, perhaps, in the earlier version of the epic. We know that the poem must have passed through various changes between the time of its composition in the early eighth century and its present MS. form in the

tenth. It is unintelligently written, and so full of blunders and inaccuracies that it has always afforded endless opportunities for conjectural emendations. It would not be unreasonable, then, to regard Beowa as the correct reading here, and the word Beowulf as the stupid substitution of some perpetuator of the poem, who was led astray by the similarity of the names, aided by the fact that Beowulf the Dane plays so small a rôle in the action.

I can see little support for Olrik's view¹ of the connection between Beowa and Danish troll-fights, or for Heusler's elaborate alternative theory that a saga-figure Sceldwa—not the same as the Danish royal ancestor Scyld (*Skelduz < *Skeldungōz)—was known to the Anglo-Saxons, Beow-Beowulf being considered his son, and that this son was inserted in the Danish royal line by the Beowulf-poet instead of Frodi or Fridlef, confusing Sceldwa and Scyld.² The identity of this son of Sceldwa with the dragon and Grendel-slayer, continues Heusler, must be assumed as unknown to this poet.—Such explanations as these seem the result of attempting to force the situation to fit the old Müllenhoffian theory, instead of constructing a theory to accord in the most unforced way with the evidence. Of course Beowulf was not the original hero of the tale; it was probably old and gray by the time it was attached to him. Just how the transference to his figure was brought about I think the available testimony insufficient to determine. It is surely exceedingly hazardous to suppose that from the single extant version of the epic, and the very doubtful testimony of the place-names, which reduces itself,

¹ *Heltedigtning*, p. 247. "Kampen med Grendel i Danernes kongehal har formodenlig faaet sin skikkelse ud fra forestillingen om hans danske byrd." I am not sure that I fully understand Olrik's argument at this point.

² *Anzeiger*, p. 32.

on the most liberal interpretation possible, to a dubious entry in a charter, the whole development of the story can be inferred. It seems antecedently unlikely that a tale which indications show to have been of Scandinavian origin should be referred to an Anglo-Saxon hero Beowa in order to explain its attachment to a Scandinavian hero Beowulf, and not wholly convincing to suppose that the English should plunder one of their favorite native champions to enrich a little-known stranger from a foreign people.

Upon such slight evidence as this, then, does the theory that Beowa was earlier the hero of the Grendel-episode depend. Even if the old Müllenhoffian hypothesis, as altered and restated by later scholars, be accepted, it must still remain only an hypothesis. When we build an argument for a connection between Beowulf and the Bjarki-saga on this foundation, we must remember how insecure an edifice we are raising. A touch, and the whole may fall like a house of cards.

V.

Mythological interpretations of Beowulf have hitherto, perhaps without exception, taken the figure of Beowa as a point of departure. If we conclude, however, that the evidence does not warrant regarding him as the "divine hero" of the Grendel-story, we shall be obliged to proceed in a very different way from previous investigators in determining how far the underlying framework of the story is mythical, and what the explanation of these myths really is. Müllenhoff's hypothesis, simple, symmetrical, and comprehensive, and bearing the prestige of a great scholar's maturest thought, has suffered some rude shocks in recent years. Yet it must always occupy a prominent place in this particular field, since it was the first attempt of any

consequence to account for the non-historical events in the poem by appealing to mythology, and since it pointed the way for other interpretations which were worked out along somewhat similar lines. But even those who believe in the validity of the methods followed by Müllenhoff have been forced to modify his original conclusions a good deal. For example, he made Beowa a manifestation of the activity of the "old god" Scaef, and endeavored to show that a far-reaching mythical conception appearing in the life of the Lombard hero Lamissio might underly the situation in *Beowulf*. Scholars are not agreed as to the origin of the figure of Scaef or its precise relationship to Scyld, but on neither of the two theories which are most prominent to-day is there any support for the god Scaef as Müllenhoff conceived him. That the graceful story of the boy sailing in an open boat to the land of his future people was told originally of Scaef, or that Scaef's three successors in the genealogy were mythic fictions embodying his different characteristics needs no detailed refutation at the present day. The attachment of the motive to Scaef must be, as an examination of the sources shows, a later development. Hermann Möller's "son of the sheaf" theory, which makes the proper name Scaef a mere development of the epithet "Scefing," taken as a patronymic, is still in many ways the most convincing one. Olrik agrees that Scyld was the hero of the boat-story before Scaef was. He believes that Scaef was originally Sceafa, the ruler of the Lombards mentioned in *Widsith*, and that his connection with Scyld was due to the Anglo-Saxon passion for genealogising. The sheaf, which comes into the tale in the version of William of Malmesbury, was, he thinks, a development out of the patronymic, and not vice versa. Both Heusler and Chadwick refuse to admit the identity of the names Scaef and Sceafa. Chadwick argues that the sheaf is an original and

fundamental element, for which he finds support in popular tradition, and sees in Scyld the husband of Gefion, the goddess of agriculture. The transference of the story from Scyld to Scaef is, he says, accounted for by the desire to get rid of the inconsistency in telling a foundling-story of a child whose epithet Scefing is taken to mean "son of Scaef."—We will not attempt to decide this problem. Whatever the conclusion, the theory that Beowa is an "hypostasis" of Scaef must be decisively rejected. And that Beowa had originally any relation to Scyld, that this was an "uralter Mythenbestand," as Brandl says, appears in the light of these recent researches, exceedingly doubtful.¹

The scope of the present paper precludes any detailed criticism of Müllenhoff and his followers and imitators. It is an exceedingly difficult task to summarize the opinions of scholars on mythology; they are frequently inconsistent and complicated by other theories.² Even among those who accept much of Müllenhoff's interpretation of Beowulf, there are expressions of distrust, of inquiry whether his reconstructions may not have been too daring.³ Criticism of Müllenhoff is really superfluous in view of the acute and searching analysis by Boer, who shows most convincingly the weakness of certain fundamental arguments of this system.⁴ Boer attacks with justice the idea that the order of the adventures in the present form of the epic must

¹ On this general subject, see Olrik, *Heltedigtning*, pp. 223 ff.; Chadwick, *Origin of the Eng. Nation*, pp. 269 ff.; Binz, Paul-Braune, *Beiträge*, vol. xx, pp. 147 ff.; Möller, *Altengl. Volksepos*, pp. 43 ff.; Müllenhoff, *Beowulf*, p. 9.

² For a discussion of this, see G. Schütte, *Oldsagn om Godtjod*, pp. 13–33, Cop., 1907. See esp. his summary, p. 31 f. "Kun hos enkelte Forskere finder vi fuld Udprægning af de hinanden modsatte Standpunkter: yderst paa Mytesiden staar Scherer og Kögel, yderst paa den 'flade Euhemerismes' Side staar Wilhelm Müller."

³ Mogk, Paul's *Grundriss*, vol. III, p. 244.

⁴ *Archiv*, loc. cit.

represent the old mythical sequence of summer and winter, —a fundamental necessity for the interpretation of the story as a “seasons-myth.” He has much to say, too, of the conclusions which were drawn from a comparison of Beowa and Scaef-Scyld. With the constructive part of his monograph I am entirely unable to agree. The dragon and Grendel, he thinks, developed out of an earlier monster, whose mythical function it was to represent “the horrors of the long winter night.” The dragon-fight is now generally thought to be a later addition to the story, to have no organic connection with the earlier adventures. (Cf. Brandl, p. 996.) Even if comparison of the different versions of the saga did not lead to this conclusion, Boer’s theory could hardly maintain itself. One scarcely sees why a flying dragon which spews out fire, or a bone-cracking, vampire-like troll suggests the horror of winter nights, nor does Boer anywhere make this plain. Perhaps it is as reasonable as to equate a fire-drake in the air with the wintry sea, as Müllenhoff did. It looks, however, as though Boer had fallen into an error similar to that in which he has detected others, and laid himself open to the danger of being hoist with his own petar. His more detailed arguments are so little likely to command assent that it seems doubtful whether a mythical hypothesis based on them could prove convincing to anyone. On the other hand, he rightly lays great stress on certain changes in methods of investigation. Scholars have been slow to perceive that the mythology in Beowulf is the ultimate goal of criticism, and in no wise its starting-point. For the solution of so difficult a matter all the aid which other lines of investigation can give is needed.

One of the most recent, cautious, and authoritative statements of the present view in regard to mythology in the poem is to be found in Professor Brandl’s contribution to the *Grundriss* replacing ten Brink’s history of Anglo-

Saxon literature, left incomplete in consequence of his early death. Brandl makes the mythical elements the point of departure, as did earlier critics generally. It is impossible to do full justice to his statements, since lack of space has forced upon them a condensation which sometimes leaves doubt as to his exact meaning. His general position is clear, however. The swimming match with Breca he believes to be a nature-myth, resting upon observation of local conditions in the waters about the Scandinavian peninsula. Breca is "the breaker." "Das Motiv beruht auf der menschenartigen Ausmalung eines Naturvorganges: aufgebrochen und offen gehalten wird das südsandinavische Meer im Winter durch den Wind, im westlichen Norwegen aber sorgt der Golfstrom für freies Fahrwasser. Es ist offenbar eine Lokalbeobachtung aus der Nähe der alten Angelnheimat, die von den Eroberern mit nach England gebracht wurde." It is not clear just how the wind and the gulf-stream fit into the story. Where is the contest? Is Breca the wind and his companion the gulf-stream? That the peoples among whom such conceptions may be supposed to have arisen knew enough about ocean currents to personify them in this way seems highly doubtful, just as it does in the case of Müllenhoff's "polar current," which he equated with Breca. We shall inquire presently whether it is really necessary to assume any mythical basis in this episode at all. The identification of Breca with Breoca, the ruler of the Brondings mentioned by Widsith, seems reasonable enough, but gives us little assistance. There seems to be no real evidence that the Brondings were a sea-people. Brandl inclines to believe the slayer of Grendel a protecting agricultural hero—apparently by virtue of his race and name—while Grendel himself may stand for "corn-grinding, the work of slaves, the sign of the conquered foe." Yet, as Brandl admits, the name

"Grinder" is sufficiently accounted for by the crunching of the monster's victims in his powerful teeth. The myth appears to be, on Brandl's interpretation, a culture-myth, not a seasons-myth. This is more convincing,—seasons-myths are generally recognizable as such, as Lang says, which is not true of *Beowulf*,—and the separation of the dragon-incident destroys the cyclic character indispensable for such an interpretation. Yet one feels that the evidence is entirely insufficient to support Brandl's reconstruction, cautious as it is, and inclines to accept rather his earlier statement that the separation of the old mythical kernel in the epic, in the Breca and the Grendel episodes, is an impossibility.¹

There is a certain inconsistency, too, in Brandl's hypothesis, taken as a whole. He thinks the Grendel-story originated in the Scandinavian highlands, that it was taken by the Anglo-Saxons to Britain, and that its attachment to the figure of Beowa-Beowulf was due to them (p. 995). Beowa was a "Schutzheros des Ackerbaues," (p. 992). But if the Grendel-motive was of Scandinavian origin, and later attached to Beowa, it cannot be a development of a myth of Beowa, and there is little propriety in assuming that Grendel represents corn-grinding, etc., unless one supposes that this foreign material was made over to fit abstract ideas, instead of growing out of them, as is usually held by the mythologists. In other words, the tale cannot have the organic connection with the Beowa-myth which is generally credited to it, if its attachment to Beowa was late and secondary.

¹ "Müllenhoff hat Grendel für die Nordsee, Mogk für einen Walfisch, Laistner für einen Nebel erklärt; Breca gilt bei Müllenhoff für den Sturm, bei Möller für den Golfstrom, bei Sarrazin für die untergehende Sonne, bei Heinzel nur für einen berühmten Schwimmer. Daraus ersieht man, wie wenig es möglich ist, den alten mythischen Kern noch herauszuschälen." *Sitzungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 12-26 Feb., 1901. *Archiv*, vol. 108, p. 153.

In the last thirty years or so methods of mythological analysis have been subjected to a pretty searching criticism, with the result that much which was once thought canonical has since been rejected. In *Middlemarch* the mighty work upon which Mr. Casaubon was engaged was, we are told, "A Key to All Mythologies." There seems an even greater appropriateness to-day in this as a symbol of the fruitless efforts of scholarship to accomplish the impossible. The notion that one key or one kind of key would unlock the mysteries of all myths, even those of a single people or age, has been given up, and it has been more generally perceived that different systems of investigation may throw light on the matter in different ways. The philological method, to which a whole army of mythologists have pinned their faith, has been much narrowed in its application. On the other hand, the "anthropological" method, of which Mr. Andrew Lang has been the most ardent defender, has been found to explain far more convincingly the silly, brutal, and obscene elements in the myths of civilized people. *Beowulf* needs no such service as this. But the assaults of Lang and others at the philological fortress of Max Müller and those of his faith reveal the weaknesses in the entrenchments of the Müllenhoffian party. Much of the mythologising of *Beowulf* still rests upon etymologies, in regard to which there is little unanimity of opinion. History repeats itself; the same lack of agreement was characteristic of the deliberations of those who attempted to establish a system of comparative Indo-Germanic mythology in this way. And there has been increasing scepticism in regard to results so reached. Mannhardt's criticism of the methods to which he had once given allegiance is a familiar example. But there are modes in scholarship, as there are in dress. Perhaps, were Müllenhoff living to-day, he would hardly defend some of the linguistic explanations advanced in his book on *Beowulf*.

Consider the famous etymology of Beaw,—“das wort gehört zur wurzel bhû ‘sein, wohnen, werden, wachsen,’ . . und Beav repräsentiert das ruhige wohnen und wirtschaften.” Kögel sees in Beowa a waving wheat-field. Laistner connected the word with the Gothic *baugjan*, and made Beowa “der Feger,” and a mist-hero. Brandl derives it from *búan*, “bauen.” It cannot be said that any more real light is thrown upon Beowa’s activities by these etymologies than by the charters and genealogies.

The same lack of agreement appears in explanations of the poem when considered as a whole. The older investigators were inclined to regard it as a seasons-myth, the more recent ones frequently see in it a culture-myth. Sijmons believes it a combination of the two,—“durch den Kulturmythus bricht der ältere Naturmythus durch, woraus er erwachsen ist.” And so, partly on an imaginative and partly on a philological basis,—using the word in its broader sense—have these elaborate mythological structures been raised. Their champions endeavor to disarm suspicion by assuring us that their interpretations are “ungezwungen” or “nicht schwer.” But they cannot all be right. Was the precursor of the present hero a wind-god, or a light-god, or a summer-god, or only a culture-hero? Was Breca the storm, or the gulf stream, or the setting sun? Was Grendel the sea, or a pestilential mist, or a werewolf, or the Lernæan Hydra? Is the dragon the “mists of the heights,” or the stormy sea, or winter, or the terrors of the winter nights? One is reminded of Mr. Lang’s sceptical comments on the myth of Kronos, “He may be Time, or perhaps he is the Summer Heat, and a horned god, or he is the harvest god, or the god of storm and darkness, or the midnight sky,—the choice is wide; or he is the lord of dark and light, and his children are the stars, the clouds, the summer-months, the light-powers, or

what you will. The mythologist has only to make his selection."¹

Much of the mythologising about *Beowulf* has been a purely imaginative process, carried on by scrutiny of the poem alone. Grendel has characteristics which connect him with the sea, others which connect him with mists, and it is distinctly said that he dwells in darkness. So a fairly good case can be made out for him as a sea-demon or a mist-demon or a darkness-demon. He has traits which remind one of Balder and Thor and Freyr. Some of his adventures bear a more or less striking resemblance to deeds done by those divinities, and his figure may possibly have been adorned with traits borrowed from one of them. But this does not warrant making him a humanized deity. There is little to check the riot of the investigator's fancy, even in connecting the events of the poem with incidents in Scandinavian or Indian mythology. It is not, indeed, wholly a false procedure to endeavor to get at the imaginative processes of early peoples by placing oneself as far as possible in sympathy with their ideas and ideals, and then letting imaginative speculation serve as a guide. It breaks down in the present case, at least, because the material with which we have to work has preserved so little of whatever mythological basis it may have had originally that no sure deductions or trustworthy imaginative reactions are possible, and because we have not yet gained a sufficient insight into early literature and story to speak with entire confidence of their transmutations. The case is precisely analogous to that of the "liedertheorie," the supporters of which attempted to reconstruct *Beowulf* on the basis of an ideal and modern conception of Anglo-Saxon style in its best epic estate. Or consider the mythological elements in the older

¹ *Custom and Myth*, p. 62.

tales in the *Mabinogion*. Professor Rhys has attempted to show in detail the nature of these elements, but his arguments have failed to carry conviction to conservative scholars. Mr. Alfred Nutt, for example, states his position as follows: "Thus, whilst I fully accept the mythological character of the Four Branches, I greatly doubt the possibility of a satisfactory mythological interpretation. The alterations have been too far-reaching, nor is it possible to say how far they may not be either deliberate or due to sheer caprice. . . . Professor Rhys' fascinating and ingenious 'solar' explanations may be read in his books . . . I cannot profess to be convinced by them."¹

In a sense, then, mythical interpretations of *Beowulf* cannot be refuted. A theory built upon imagination, rather than upon facts, can no more be disproved than established. If the parallels to mythical conceptions elsewhere than in Germanic literature are slight, the mythologist does not regard this as necessarily prejudicial to his case. And he is right; such resemblances must in the nature of things be slight, obscured by the lapse of time and differences of environment. The recurrence of typical motives does not necessarily constitute connection. The possibility that incidents, originally mythical, may have been transferred to a hero after their specifically mythical quality has faded out must also be considered. Fortuitous resemblances, too, there may well be. When Sarrazin, for instance, unites a large number of heroic stories into one great class of Balder-Frey myths, there is really no way of refuting the theory. The resemblances, had the development been actually as he conceives it, would probably have been no more striking than they are. The question is merely whether one believes

¹ *The Mabinogion*, translated by Lady Guest, with notes by Alfred Nutt, London, 1902, p. 332.

in the possibility of applying such criteria and getting definite results. To many the conclusions will seem as shadowy as the arguments. And, in the same way, no absolute refutation of the mythological reconstructions of Müllenhoff or Laistner appears possible.

There is a strong allurement about such methods. The man who would fathom the imaginative literature of early days must be something of a poet as well as a scholar. "Wer den Dichter will verstehen, muss in Dichters Lande gehen." So Uhland interpreted myth and saga. And great subtlety and learning have been devoted to fathoming the secret of *Beowulf*. Moreover, the task has the fascination of any puzzle, the same charm which sets men to studying anew the career of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, or the Man of the Iron Mask, or finding new subtleties in *Hamlet*. It is probably a safe assertion that nine-tenths of all that critics have discerned in *Hamlet* was never dreamed of by Shakspeare. And so with our epic. It has been a fashion in criticism to see allegory hidden beneath the surface of a seemingly straightforward narrative. There has been a whole school of investigators, who, to borrow a phrase from Rajna, cannot see a cat chase a mouse without imagining therein the eternal struggle of day and night, or of summer and winter. It is well to be cautious about plundering, for the sake of a fancied scholarly completeness, an antiquity of which we no longer possess the secret.

It only remains for scepticism to take one step more to make incredulity complete. Why assume a mythical framework in *Beowulf* at all?

This is heresy of the first degree. Müllenhoff laid it down as an axiom at the beginning of his studies that "every epic saga and the substance of every popular epic consists of two elements, myth and history." Later investigators proceed on essentially the same principle. Sievers, for

example, speaks of "die beiden in unserem epos verquickten Überlieferungsgeschichten, die ich kurzweg 'mythus' und 'sage' nennen will."¹ But what is there in the story of *Beowulf* which justifies us in explaining it as a broken-down nature or culture myth? It can hardly have retained any such significance for those who heard it in its present form. No one will dispute that a study of primitive society shows a strong tendency among primitive peoples to personify abstract ideas or natural forces, and to present these in the concrete narrative dress which we call myth. On the other hand, it is equally certain that they must have had other narratives, some based on imaginary events, others historical, though sometimes only in the sense that they actually happened, and not deserving all the dignity that the term "historical" implies. Such stories would be elaborated by imaginative accretions of popular fancy, but would have no connection with operations of nature, states of culture, abstract ideas, or divinities, except in so far as the natural tendency to exalt a hero may have led to giving him god-like attributes. The story of Beowulf and Breca, to take a concrete illustration, may well be no more than an exaggerated swimming-match between two mortal men, an event which made itself remembered by the endurance of the contestants. Or it may have been purely imaginary in its origin, having no connection with gods or meteorological observations. Elaborations come easily to an early people; hence the seven days in the water, and the fights with the sea-monsters. So Roland, who is no more mythical than Roosevelt, blows his horn with such vigor that it is heard miles away, performs prodigies of valor impossible for a mortal, while the very sun in the heavens stops in its course to aid in avenging him. The swimming-match, it is impor-

¹ *Sitzungsber. der Gesell. der Wiss. zu Leipzig*, vol. XLVII, p. 175.

tant to observe, was a friendly contest of strength between two youths, and in no way suggests the defeat of a baleful power by a beneficent one.

Wit þæt gecwædon cniht-wesende
 ond gebēotedon (wæron bēgen þā gīt
 on geogoð-fēore) þæt wit on gār-secg ūt
 aldrum nēðdon ; ond þæt geæfndon swā.¹

Yet how this simple situation has been distorted by the mythologists !

Nor is there any need of assuming a mythical ² origin for the contest with Grendel, unless one believes that every spook is traceable to such an origin. There can be little doubt that Grendel is the product of the imagination of many men, and that if in the beginning he did have a clearly defined character, whether mythical or realistic, this has been much obscured by later conceptions. How shall we determine the first stage in the growth of his figure ? Skeat, going to the opposite extreme from the mythologists, conjectured that the story was originally that of a fight with a gigantic bear. This is possible, but there is no way to prove it. It is quite as likely that the various bear-characteristics which Grendel displays are due to the tendency of simple people to make their demons vivid by giving them

¹ Ll. 535 ff.

² It is hardly necessary to explain that the word "myth," as used in the present paper, does not mean merely an invented story, something having no existence in fact, but "a traditional story in which the operations of natural forces and occurrences in human history are represented as the actions of individual living beings, especially of men, or of imaginary extra-human beings acting like men." See the full definition in the *Century Dictionary* under *myth*. It will be observed that a mere folk-tale, even one to the hero of which divine attributes have been given, does not belong under this definition, unless it can be shown that the adventures narrated were conceived at some time as explaining abstract ideas or natural phenomena.

the attributes of their enemies in the beast-world. Nobody knows how a fiend looks; he has to be visualized, like the mediæval devil, by imagining in him the terrible and repulsive traits of beasts. The descent from Cain is only a more easily separable and recognizable example of this tendency to elaborate Grendel's figure. Could we follow the shifting shapes of the monster back through the years, we should probably be astonished at the variety of his transformations. But we must be careful not to attach undue importance to any one set of characteristics, however prominent they may be. An uncanny creature of evil, Grendel abides in darkness, fog, and desolation, because the mystery and terror that surround him are thus heightened, but this is no reason for regarding him as a personification of any one of them. There is really no evidence of myth beyond the supernatural in the story, and that is of course no evidence at all. No explanatory quality makes itself felt; there are no clear signs that the central figure of the epic was once a deity. Never once, so far as I can see, is one justified in assuming that the deeds of Beowulf are not those of a mortal hero, with such exaggerations as have been added to the exploits of heroes of all ages, from Alexander to Richard the Lion-Hearted.

I feel that it may well be doubted, then, that the adventures of Beowulf have the sort of origin commonly assigned to them, and even if they have such an origin, I question whether it is possible, with the evidence now at command, to arrive at any safe conclusions in regard to these early developments. The determination of how far mythical beginnings may be assumed for the epic in general is too large a subject to be discussed here. But that this element in epic has been vastly exaggerated seems beyond dispute. One cannot do better than to read the brilliant criticism by Pio Rajna, in the opening chapter of his *Origini dell' Epopea*

Francesse, first published in 1884. He may well be selected as a representative of the opponents of the Müllenhoffian school because of his learning and impartiality, and because he has stated his case with great vigor and clearness. He says: "The opinion most in favor among scholars who have thus far occupied themselves with this subject is undoubtedly this: that the origins of epic are mythical, or that the deeds upon which the epic in its primitive state is based may be reduced, in the last analysis, to mere symbolical expressions of the phenomena of nature." . . . The conclusion of his criticism he sums up as follows: "Therefore, before it could have been furnished by the heavens, epic material already existed upon earth, not only in actual facts, but also as an object of thought and imagination. The myth is, then, itself a reflection of conceptions adapted to produce the epic, which have in reality, independently of any celestial intervention, produced poems and songs without number. Nay, more, it is necessary to go farther; there is not, at bottom, any other material than this in the epic. The smallest deduction which may be drawn from this is that the hypothesis of mythical origin is at least superfluous. But whoever considers that this hypothesis forces us to argue in a vicious circle, and makes us leap through the clouds only to find ourselves ultimately at the very place from which we started, will be inclined to go a little farther, and to pronounce it contrary to the natural order of things."¹

The poem loses nothing of its picturesqueness in being denied its mythology. The fire-drake and Grendel and the she-demon are more terrible when conceived as uncanny and abominable beings whose activities in the world can only be dimly imagined by men than they are when made mere per-

¹ P. 10.

sonifications of the forces of nature. Beowulf is no less heroic as a mortal facing with undaunted courage these grisly phantoms of the moor and mere than as a god subduing the sea or the darkness. And the proud words that he utters in his dying hour are more impressive from the lips of a man than from those of a being who still retains some of the glory of a god about him,—“In my home I awaited what time might bring me, held well mine own, sought no treacherous feuds, swore no false oaths. In all this I can rejoice, though sick unto death with my wounds.”

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE.

NOTE :—Since the above was sent to the printer, Professor Gummere has expressed his opinion in regard to mythological elements in *Beowulf* in no uncertain way. “Undoubtedly one is here on the border-land of myth. But in the actual poem the border is not crossed. Whatever the remote connection of Beowulf the hero with Beowa the god, whatever this god may have in him of the old Ingævonian deity whom men worshipped by North Sea and Baltic as god of fertility and peace and trade, whatever echo of myths about a destroying monster of invading ocean tides and storms may linger in the story of Grendel and his horrible mother, nothing of the sort comes out of the shadow of conjecture into the light of fact. To the poet of the epic its hero is a man, and the monsters are such as folk then believed to haunt sea and lake and moor. Hrothgar’s people who say they have seen the uncanny pair speak just as real rustics would speak about ghosts and strange monsters which they had actually encountered. In both cases one is dealing with folk-lore and not with mythology. When these crude superstitions are developed by priest and poet along polytheistic lines, and in large relations of time and space, myth is the result. But the actual epic of Beowulf knows nothing of this process; and there is no need to regard Grendel or his mother as backed by the artillery of doom, to regard Beowulf as the embodiment of heaven’s extreme power and goodwill.” (*The Oldest English Epic*, N. Y., 1900, pp. 5f.) A statement more completely in accord with the point of view in the present article could scarcely be desired.—W. W. L.

X.—STELLA AND THE *BROKEN HEART*.

In the prologue to the *Broken Heart*, Ford says :

“What may be here thought Fiction, when time's youth
Wanted some riper years, was known a Truth.”¹

This interesting clue to the source of the play has not been carefully followed up. “The origin of the story on which it is founded,” says Ward, “is unknown ; but unless the Prologue's assertion that the plot is based on fact is to be taken literally, its source is probably some nearly contemporary novel. Either Ford or the novelist from whom he borrowed made little account of historical probability in choosing Sparta as the scene of a love-tragedy which savours of mediæval Italy.”² Ellis, also, remarks that the scene is “curiously placed in Sparta,” and adds that the story “may have been taken from an Italian novel.”³

These observations and conjectures seem to me somewhat misleading. In the first place, we should consider Ford innocent until he is proved guilty. From what we know of his character, we have no good reason to doubt his veracity. From the scant humour, the gravity and artistic seriousness of his work, we may rather infer that he was the last man in the world to attempt a hoax. Of course, the words of the Prologue must not be taken too literally. We are not, by any means, to understand that Ford vouched for the truth of all the particular incidents so effectively combined for the purposes of the play, but so unlikely to occur in life in such combination. To suppose that Ford intended

¹ *Works*, London, 1869, I, 215.

² Ward, *History of English Dramatic Literature*, London, 1899, III, 79.

³ *Mermaid Ford*, new edition, 184.

his readers to believe in the historical truth of the *Broken Heart* as it stands, Spartan setting and all, is indeed ridiculous. We must concede him the license of poet and dramatist to work up the material and to adorn the tale. If we make him this reasonable concession, we shall not be puzzled by the theatrical dance and startling heart-failure of Calantha or the sensational murder of Ithocles. Ford, like his fellows of that late imitative period, gathers hints from far and wide; incidents such as these, savouring, perhaps, of mediæval Italy, may have come from different sources, and be no part of the original story. In another place, Ford requests you

“to cast your eye
Rather upon the *main* than on the *bye*.”¹

The “main” with Ford is always the “heart interest,” the crisis in the spirit. Ellis interprets the lines already quoted thus: “It is said in the Prologue that the story . . . has some foundation in fact.”² The proper inference to draw from the Prologue is, to my thinking, that the essential spiritual situation, however decked and disguised, is taken from life. Ford tells us in fairly plain English that his play presents what some years earlier was known as truth. No convention prescribed such an assurance, honest or otherwise; the audience did not expect it; Ford’s fellow dramatists did not customarily furnish it. The information is purely voluntary; since there is no apparent reason for deception, let us suppose that it is honest information.

But, if we accept Ford’s assertion of the truth of his story, we shall have to find fault with the conjectures of Ward and Ellis as to the source of it. A certain savour of mediæval Italy (to me, not perfectly distinct) has led them

¹ *Works*, I, 7.

² *Mermaid Ford*, 184.

to suspect that Ford found his material in an Italian novel. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that such was the case. This Italian novel would have supplied Ford with Italian characters and places, possibly with Italian proverbs, snatches of song, local allusions. Why did he go to the labor of converting his material—of resetting the story in Sparta? Ford was sufficiently at home in Italy; it was, in fact, his favorite scene. (He knew how to handle Italian “local color,” as he showed most admirably in *'Tis Pity* and *Love's Sacrifice*, which, as well as *The Fancies* and the *Lady's Trial*, he set in Italy, where they clearly belong.) If he had found the story of the *Broken Heart* in an Italian novel, and had given it an English dress, we should have had no difficulty in understanding the reason for the transformation. But what motive shall we assign for his concealing an Italian love-story from an English audience under this strange Spartan disguise, and then piquing curiosity by gratuitously asserting its truth?

This question leads to another: Discarding the Italian hypothesis, can we give any satisfactory explanation of the fact that the story was so “curiously placed in Sparta,” with so “little account of historical probability”? Accept Ford's assertion of the truth of the story, and the answer is evident enough. (Why was Jonson's *Poetaster* set in the time of Augustus, or Dekker's *Satiromastix* so “curiously placed” in the reign of William Rufus? The *Broken Heart* is set in Sparta to veil a true English love-story from an English audience; that seems the almost inevitable explanation.)

With that notion in mind, we shall have no difficulty in understanding the choice of Sparta. Why the critics should balk at Ford's Sparta is, I confess, not quite clear to me. It is not, indeed, the historical Sparta; yet no one seems to have noticed that it had been annexed to the English imagi-

nation for some fifty years when Ford settled upon it. When Ford wrote the *Broken Heart*, Sparta had already long been a well-defined province of the sky-land of allegory and romance. (The Sparta of Ford's play is the Sparta created by Sidney in his *Arcadia*, where just such events took place as are presented in the play, just such tragedies of love and hate, with just such savour of mediæval Italy.¹ In the *Arcadia* Ford found his Spartan "atmosphere" ready-made. Indeed, the action of the *Broken Heart* takes place at the same imaginary period as that of the *Arcadia*. King Amyclas of Laconia heads the list of dramatis personæ in the tragedy, and King Amyclas reigns over the Laconia of Sidney's romance. Here is no question of historical probability. Surely, the public that had devoured ten editions of the *Arcadia* before the *Broken Heart* was published would recognize their Laconia when they saw it, and infer from the prologue what I have suggested above: The germ of this drama, obscured by the conventional romantic disguise, is a true English love-story.

How close to the "truth" Ford's readers could hit, it would be idle to speculate. The fact that the story was laid in Sidney's Laconia may possibly have suggested that it had something to do with Sidney himself; if Ford was dealing with Sidney's love-story, he could have chosen no disguise more suitable than that which Sidney employed. The allegorical threads of the *Arcadia*, however, are so inextricably interwoven with pure fancy that they furnish no guide to the *Broken Heart*. Fortunately, another clear clue leads us in the same direction toward the true love-story: Ford, in his youth, took an ardent interest in the love affairs of Sidney's "Stella," then Countess of Devonshire. In fact,

¹ Compare, for example, the famous story of Argalus and Parthenia, retold in verse by Francis Quarles, in 1621.

his first literary effusion, the generally neglected *Fame's Memorial* (1606), was called forth by the death of Charles Blount, second husband of "Stella," and was dedicated to the Lady Penelope, County of Devonshire, that is, "Stella," herself. The poem is both a eulogy and a vindication. Devonshire had died broken-hearted over the disgrace he had incurred at court by his marriage with Lady Rich (Penelope), and she, at the date of this dedication, seems still to have been under a cloud of disfavor and slander.¹ Ford rushed in to champion her, actuated only by the justice of the cause.

" Let merit take her due, unfee'd I write,
Compell'd by instance of apparent right,
Nor chok'd with private hopes do I indite,
But led by truth as known as is the light." ²

The merits of the case were perhaps not beyond question. The bare facts were these:³ Penelope had been married to Lord Rich against her will; Rich was mean, brutal and jealous; then came Devonshire, "a person famous for conduct and so eminent in courage and learning, that in these respects he had no superior;"⁴ Devonshire and Lady Rich formed an illicit union; Lord Rich put away his wife; Devonshire married her. The situation evidently interested Ford greatly. He was always on the side of lovers. All errors of lovers seemed to him venial; their sins,—at the worst, splendid sins. Over the virtual adultery committed and the actual adultery forecast in *Love's Sacrifice*, even over the incest of *'Tis Pity*, he shed tears of compassion and

¹ *Works*, III; see Epistle Dedicatory of *Fame's Memorial*.

² *Ibid.*, 309.

³ *Ibid.*, 281. See also, Fox-Bourne's *Memorial* of Sir Philip Sidney, London, 1862, 376, Note.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 279, Note.

admiration. Truly, for him love covered a multitude of sins. The Lady Penelope evidently fascinated his imagination; her career had been so romantic—she had loved so much, and had been loved so much.

A score of years after this first romantic defense of Stella, Ford, moved by a similar inspiration, wrote the *Broken Heart*. His purpose, once more, was to present the conflict between the rights of the heart and the conventions of society, and to champion the cause of the heart. Again, he dealt with a heroine, married against her will to a jealous and brutal husband, and pursued by a fond and faithful lover. There is a general resemblance to the Devonshire-Lady Rich affair, but there are more important differences. Possibly the most fundamental of these is, that the lady of the play preserves her virtue in spite of the importunity of the lover, and in spite of the fact that she loves him and recognizes the ideal justice of his claims. For,—a second important difference,—the lady and the lover of the play were engaged to marry before she was forced to wed the unworthy husband; so that, in an ideal sense, she feels that she is living in adultery with her legal husband. But these differences that distinguish the situation in the play from the Devonshire-Lady Rich affair help to identify it with an earlier and more celebrated affair, the love story of Sidney and Penelope Devereux. A youth as much interested in Lady Penelope as Ford had shown himself to be would have been eager to know the particulars of her early history. The internal history of the love affair lay open to him in *Astrophel and Stella*. That he had means of access to the external facts it is scarcely necessary to prove here, since the *Broken Heart*, as I believe, demonstrates that he had possession of them. In other words, I believe that the “truth” upon which Ford asserted that the play was based is the story of Sidney’s love for “Stella,” the one appro-

priate historical character, outside the plays, in whom we know that he was vitally interested. I do not maintain that the *Broken Heart* is an allegory. It is rather the imaginative working out of a dramatic situation from real life,—a dramatic situation that in real life came to nothing. Sidney's affair with "Stella" lacked the fifth act; Ford's imagination supplied it, and something more. A brief comparison of the situation laid down in the play, particularly in the first act, with the historical facts, plus the testimony of *Astrophel and Stella*, will make this clear.

1. (a) The parents of Orgilus and Penthea, formerly at odds, became reconciled, and sealed their faith by pledging their children in marriage.¹

(b) Sir Henry Sidney and the Earl of Essex has not been on the best of terms;² but Philip Sidney was a great favorite with the Earl. Sir Henry was anxious to make a helpful family alliance. There was, on the other hand, reason to believe that Philip was to be the heir of his wealthy uncle Leicester. These considerations seem to have been influential in the betrothal of the children.³

2. (a) Before the marriage could take place, Thrasus, Penthea's father, "untimely" died. His death was fatal to the match; had he lived, the lovers would have been united.

"we had enjoy'd
The sweets our vows expected, had not cruelty
Prevented all those triumphs we prepared for,
By Thrasus his untimely death." ⁴

¹ *Works*, I, 218.

² Symonds, *Sidney*, London, 1902, 36: "Writing to Lord Leicester, he (Sir Henry Sidney) couples Essex with his old enemy the Earl of Ormond, adding that 'for that their malice, I take God to record, I could brook nothing of them both?'"

³ Fox-Bourne, *passim*.

⁴ *Works*, I, 218.

(b) Essex, Penelope's father, was cut off suddenly by a strange illness. Two days before death, Essex said: "I wish him (Philip) well—so well that, if God do move their hearts, I wish that he might match with my daughter."¹ This wish, expressed on his death bed, was practically a last will and testament.—In the play Penthea reproaches her brother

"For forfeiting the last will of the dead" ²

by breaking off the match.

3. (a) Penthea's brother, moved by ambition, broke off the match and married her to a man of higher rank and greater wealth than her lover, Orgilus.

"By cunning partly,
Partly by threats, he woos at once and forces
His virtuous sister to admit a marriage
With Bassanes, a nobleman, in honour
And riches, I confess, beyond my fortunes." ³

(b) Penelope's guardian evidently thought he would make a better match for her than that desired by her deceased father.⁴ Sidney was not knighted till 1583; his means were always limited; and his hope of becoming Leicester's heir was cut off by that nobleman's marriage in 1578. Penelope's guardian, accordingly, arranged a match with Lord Rich, "inheritor of all the wealth and—said his contemporaries—of much of the vulgar and brutal disposition of his father, Lord Chancellor Rich." ⁵

4. (a) Penthea went to the altar a wholly unwilling bride:

"Beauteous Penthea, wedded to this torture
By an insulting brother, being secretly
Compell'd to yield her virgin freedom up
To him, who never can usurp her heart,
Before contracted mine.—" ⁶

¹ Fox-Bourne, 129.

² Works, I, 260.

³ Works, 219.

⁴ Fox-Bourne, 286.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Works, I, 219.

"How, Orgilus, by promise I was thine
The heavens do witness ; they can witness too
A rape done on my truth." ¹

(b) Penelope married under violent protest. She, "being in the power of her friends, was married, against her will, unto one against whom she did protest at the very solemnity and ever after the same fears that forced her to marry constrained her to live with him." ²

5. (a) Penthea's brother interfered to protect her from her husband. At one time, indeed, he took her to his own house and told Bassanes that she was to be returned only on his good behaviour. ³

(b) Similar testimony is given of the part Penelope's brother played in the family affairs. "He (Lord Rich) forebore to offer her any open wrong, restrained with the awe of her brother's powerfulness." ⁴

6. (a) Penthea's husband was mean, jealous, and brutal. According to Orgilus, she was "yok'd"

"To a most barbarous thralldom, misery,
Affliction, that he savours not humanity,
Whose sorrow melts not into more than pity
In hearing but her name." ⁵

Bassanes is full of a kind of "monster love" ⁶ that finds expression in mad jealousy.

(b) On the character of Lord Rich, see 3 (b) above. Also compare Sidney's punning sonnet on Lord Rich beginning:

"Rich fooles there be whose base and filthie heart—" ⁷

¹ *Ibid.*, 251.

² Fox-Bourne, 288.

³ *Works*, I, 266.

⁴ Devereux, *Lives of the Earls of the Essex*, I, 155.

⁵ *Works*, I, 219.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Complete Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, London, 1877, I, 36.

In this sonnet, Sidney speaks of the "foule abuse" inflicted upon Stella by her husband.

7. (a) At the beginning of the play Orgilus undertook a voluntary exile from Penthea's presence in order to quiet her husband and to relieve her and to calm himself.

(b) The *Astrophel and Stella* presents a series of sonnets beginning with LXXXVII, written in absence enjoined by "Stella's" sense of duty.

8. (a) Orgilus's passion took command of him; he pursued Penthea and demanded the satisfaction of his love.

"If thy soft bosom be not turn'd to marble
Thou'lt pity our calamities; my interest
Confirms me thou art mine still.

.
I would possess my wife; the equity
Of very reason bids me."¹

(b) Sidney, likewise, determined to pursue his love at all cost:

"No more, my deare, no more these counsels trie;
O give my passions leave to run their race;
Let Fortune lay on me her worst disgrace."²

In this sonnet, Sidney makes the romantic identification of love with virtue, which is the fundamental note in Ford's treatment of passion.

9. (a) Orgilus's passionate purpose was thwarted only by Penthea's steady clinging to honor. There is a striking parallelism of situation and sentiment between the third scene of the second act in the *Broken Heart* and the eighth song³ of the *Astrophel and Stella*.

Orgilus and Penthea met in the garden of the palace. Orgilus urged the rights of love. Penthea swore that she

¹ *Works*, I, 251.

² *Complete Poems*, I, 85.

³ *Complete Poems*, I, 179.

had been, and still was, his alone ; but she insisted that she should best show her love by giving him his liberty ; and that he would best show his merit by ceasing to pursue her. She forbade him to speak of the subject again. He departed in a fierce passion ; whereupon, she exclaimed in pity for him and for herself :

“ Honour
How much we fight with weakness to preserve thee ! ”

(b) Astrophel and Stella met in a shady grove.

“ Him great harmes had taught much care,
Her faire necke a foul yoke bare.”

Astrophel pleaded vehemently with her to grant his desire. She replied :

“ While such-wise she love denièd,
And yet love she signifièd.”

She told him that his grief hurt her more than death ; that her only comfort came from him ; that he must not make the request again nor mention it ; that putting him away hurt her as much as him. Finally—exactly expressing Penthea’s sentiment—she assured him :

“ Tyran Honour doth thus use thee,
Stella’s selfe might not refuse thee.”

She departs,

“ Leaving him to passion rent.”

Let us add to this a part of the sixty-second sonnet,¹ in which Stella expresses almost exactly Penthea’s notion of love proved by renunciation. Stella asserted :

“ That love she did, but loved a love not blind ;
Which could not let me, whom she loved, decline
From nobler course, fit for my birth and mind ;
And therefore, by her love’s authority,
Wild me these tempests of vaine love to flie,
And anchor fast my selfe on Vertue’s shore.”¹

¹ *Complete Poems*, I, 84.

XI.—REIZ IST SCHÖNHEIT IN BEWEGUNG.

Among the most characteristic and most positive propositions in Lessing's *Laokoon* are these from chapter XXI: "Ein anderer Weg, auf welchem die Poesie die Kunst in Schilderung körperlicher Schönheit wiederum einholet, ist dieser, dass sie Schönheit in Reitz verwandelt. Reiz ist Schönheit in Bewegung." F. T. Vischer said with reference to this chapter,¹ "Lessing hatte zuerst die Anmuth (er sagt: Reiz, wovon nachher) als Schönheit in der Bewegung definiert." Commenting on the same chapter, G. E. Guhrauer wrote,² "Reiz ist Schönheit in Bewegung, und eben darum für den Maler weniger als den Dichter bequem. Dieser Begriff, eine glückliche Bereicherung der Ästhetik, von welcher Schiller späterhin in dem Aufsatz über Anmuth und Würde einen so sinnreichen und fruchtbaren Gebrauch machte, findet sich vor Lessing schon bei Home, welchen er bei seiner Vertrautheit mit den schottischen Philosophen unstreitig gekannt hat. Insofern ist es nicht ganz genau, wenn Vischer . . . von Lessing sagt, dass der Begriff der Anmuth bei ihm zuerst gefunden werde." H. Blümner³ rushed to the defence of Lessing and Vischer. Grace, he admitted, is associated with motion not only by Home, but also by Webb (*Inquiry into the Beauties of Painting*, 1764), and by Hagedorn (*Betrachtungen über die Malerey*, 1762),—"dennoch durfte Vischer mit vollem Rechte Lessing als den Vater dieses Begriffes bezeichnen, da er durch ihn erst entwickelt und in die Ästhetik eingeführt worden ist." On

¹ *Ästhetik*, Reutlingen and Leipzig, 1846, I, p. 184.

² *Lessing, sein Leben und seine Werke*, 1854, II, I, p. 47; ed. Maltzahn and Boxberger, Berlin, 1881, II, p. 43.

³ *Laokoon*, Berlin, 1880, p. 641.

a previous page (31) Blümner had pointed out that Webb's idea of grace was not his own, but went back to Home.

Blümner makes an obvious error as to the relations of Home and Webb. Webb's *Inquiry* appeared first in 1760, not 1764, as Blümner has it;¹ and the first volume of Home's *Elements of Criticism* did not appear until 1762. But Home had even more than two years in which to read Webb, if he cared to; for, as Wilhelm Neumann properly reports in his dissertation,² Home's first edition has nothing to say about grace; and, as a matter of fact, the definition in question is not made until the third edition is printed, in 1765.³

But not even Webb is "der Vater dieses Begriffes." A history of the conception in English esthetics of the eighteenth century must go back, as Franz Pomezny has done,⁴ to Shaftesbury;⁵ and ought to include, as Pomezny

¹ P. 29.

² *Die Bedeutung Home's für die Ästhetik und sein Einfluss auf die deutschen Ästhetiker*, Halle, 1894, p. 114.

³ "Grace, then, is an agreeable attribute, inseparable from motion, as opposed to rest, and as comprehending speech, looks, gestures, and locomotion" (vol. I, chapter XI, p. 347).

⁴ *Grazie und Grazien in der deutschen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts*, in Lipps and Werner's *Beiträge zur Ästhetik*, VII, Hamburg, 1900. With reference to Hogarth's *Analysis of Beauty* (London, 1753, p. v), Pomezny opines (p. 50), "Lamozzo dürfte vielleicht der erste sein, der das wesen des reizes in der bewegung liegen lässt"—meaning Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, in whose *Trattato dell' arte della Pittura, Scultura ed Architettura* (Milan, 1585), we do indeed find the sentences, "Dicesi adunque che Michelangelo diede una volta questo avvertimento a Marco da Siena pittore suo discepolo, che dovesse sempre fare la figura piramidale, serpentinata, e moltiplicata per una, due, e tre. Ed in questo precetto parmi che consista tutto il secreto della pittura, imperocchè la maggior grazia, e leggiadria che possa avere una figura è, che mostri di muoversi, il che chiamano i pittori furia della figura" (vol. I, p. 33, of the reprint at Rome, in 1844).

⁵ Shaftesbury only touches upon the subject of grace, and is far from developing a theory of it; but he invariably connects it with motion, as, for example, in these passages from his *Advice to an Author* (1710):—"Tis

did not, consideration of a little book that did not escape the notice of Neumann. On page 121 of Neumann's dissertation we read, "Früher, als sie alle, und vielleicht nicht ohne Einfluss auch auf Home, ist ein kleines Werkchen, dem wir hier Gerechtigkeit widerfahren lassen wollen, durch Anführung der unsern Gegenstand berührenden Stellen. Es ist ein Büchlein von Henry Beaumont: *Crito, or a Dialogue on Beauty*. Die zweite Auflage des populären Schriftehens, nach der ich citiere, erschien bereits im Jahre 1742."¹

My present design is only in part a contribution to the history of English esthetics; it is chiefly the *Rettung* of a man to whom Blümner did manifest injustice²—without, apparently, knowing anything more about him than what he learned from Lessing—a man to whom historians of esthetics owe more respectful attention than they seem to have given him; namely, Joseph Spence. In that very *Polymetis* (1747) from which Lessing³ quoted the sentence, "Scarce anything can be good in a poetical description which would appear absurd if represented in a statue or picture," we find a passage which Lessing may have over-

undeniable, however, that the perfection of grace and comeliness in action and behaviour can be found only among the people of a liberal education" (p. 190); "there can be no kind of writing which relates to men and manners, where it is not necessary for the author to understand poetical and moral truth, the beauty of sentiments, the sublime of characters; and carry in his eye the model or exemplar of that natural grace which gives to every action its attractive charm" (p. 336). I quote from the first volume of *Characteristicks*, the third edition, 1723.

¹ Pomezny failed to follow up a clue to this work that he had in hand. Cf. the note to p. 72: "Vgl. hierzu *Criton, ou de la grace et de la beauté. Extrait d'un Dialogue traduit librement de l'Anglois (Les Graces* [Paris, 1769], s. 225): 'Je crois même qu'il n'a point voulu faire entendre autre chose, lorsqu'il dit qu'Énée reconnut la Déesse, sa mère, sous son déguisement, à son air seul, à son port.'"

² *Laokoon*, p. 23.

³ *Laokoon*, *Nachlass B*, ed. Blümner, p. 415.

looked, but which ought not to have been overlooked by Lessing's editor, as follows:¹ "To return to the eyes and look of Venus; the poets are fuller as to the former than any statue can be. - They had the painters to copy from, as well as the statuary; and could draw several ideas from the life, which are not to be expressed in marble. The sculptor can only give you the proportions of things, and one single attitude of a person in any statue or relieve. The painter can do the same, and add the natural colours as they appear on the surfaces of things; and by the management of lights and shades, may fling them into their proper distances. The poet can describe all that either of the others express by shape, or colours; and can farther put the figure into a succession of different motions in the same description. So that of the three sister-arts of imitation, poetry (in this at least) has the advantage over both the others; as it has more power, and can take a larger compass than either of them. This must have given the poets an advantage, in describing the quick and uncertain motions of Venus's eyes; and occasions our meeting with some expressions in them, which cannot be explained either from statues, or paintings. Such is that epithet of *Pacta*, in particular, which the Roman writers give to Venus; and which refers, perhaps, to a certain turn of her eye, and her catching it away again, the moment she is observed."

Webb's *Inquiry into the Beauties of Painting* bears a dedication "To the Reverend Mr. Spence," beginning thus: "The most accurate observer of the beauties of nature must be the best judge of their imitations; and the same elegance of imagination which forms the painter, must enlighten the critic. It was natural for me, under this persuasion, to

¹ P. 67 of the second edition (1755), which has the same pagination as the first.

address my observation on Painting, to the author of *Crito*." The author of *Crito* was Joseph Spence.¹ Neumann's citations from it are accurate so far as they go; they hardly give an adequate impression of the urbanity of the style, and are purposely restricted to Spence's definition of grace. A fuller treatment of the dialogue would show Spence in interesting relations to Lomazzo (and so to Lionardo da Vinci), to Le Brun, Félibien, de Piles, Shaftesbury, and Burke, as well as to the ancient classics. I must, however, here follow Neumann's example, and confine myself to the subject of grace.

"I am apt to think," says Crito,² "that everything belonging to beauty (by which I need not repeat to you at every turn that I mean personal beauty) would fall under one or other of these four heads: color, form, expression, and grace; the two former of which I should look upon as the body, and the two latter as the soul of beauty." "A parent can see genteelness in the most awkward child, perhaps, that ever was born; and a person who is truly in love will be pleased with every motion and air of the person beloved; which is the most distinguishing character that belongs to grace. 'Tis true, this is all a mistaken grace; but, as to that particular person, it has all the effects of the true."³ "Grace often depends on some very little incidents in a fine face; and in actions, it consists more in the manner of doing things than in the things themselves. It is perpetually varying its appearances, and is therefore much more difficult to be considered than anything fixed and steady."⁴

¹ He wrote over the pseudonym "Sir Harry Beaumont" (not "Henry Beaumont" as Neumann says); and his *Crito* appeared in London in 1752, not (Neumann) 1742, or earlier. There was a reprint in *Fugitive Pieces*, vol. 1, 1762. I quote from the *Bibliotheca Curiosa*, ed. Edmund Goldsmid, privately printed, Edinburgh, 1885.

² P. 11.

³ P. 61.

⁴ P. 34.

“The chief dwelling-place of grace is about the mouth, though at times it may visit every limb or part of the body. But the mouth is the chief seat of grace, as much as the chief seat for the beauty of the passions is in the eyes.”¹

“There are two very distinct and, as it were, different sorts of grace, the majestic and the familiar (I should have called the latter by the name of pleasing, had not I been afraid of a tautology; for grace is pleasingness itself); the former belongs chiefly to the very fine women, and the latter to the very pretty ones; *that* is the more commanding, and *this* the more delightful and engaging. The Grecian painters and sculptors used to express the former most strongly in the looks and attitudes in their Minervas; and the latter, in those of Venus.”² “There is no poet I have ever read who seems to me to understand this part of beauty so well as our own Milton. He speaks of these two sorts of grace very distinctly, and gives the majestic to his Adam, and both the familiar and majestic to Eve; but the latter in a less degree than the former.”³ “Though grace is so difficult to be accounted for in general, yet I have observed two particular things which, I think, hold universally in relation to it. The first is, that there is no grace without motion; by which I mean, without some genteel or pleasing motion, either of the whole body, or of some limb, or at least of some feature.”⁴ “Virgil in one place (*Aen.* I, 46) points out the majesty of Juno, and in another (*Aen.* IV, 147) the graceful air of Apollo, by only saying that they move; and possibly he means no more when he makes the motion of Venus (*Aen.* I, 406) the principal thing by which Aeneas discovers her under all her disguise; though the commentators, as usual, would fain find out a more dark and mysterious meaning for it.”⁵

¹ P. 35.² P. 38.³ P. 39.⁴ P. 41.⁵ Pp. 41 f.

"All the best statues are represented as in some action or motion ; and the most graceful statue in the world, the Apollo Belvedere, is so much so that when one faces it at a little distance, one is always apt to imagine that he is actually going to move on toward you. All graceful heads, even in the portraits of the best painters, are in motion ; and very strongly in those of Guido in particular ; which, as you remember, are all either casting their looks up toward Heaven, or down toward the ground, or side-way, as regarding some object."¹

"The second observation is, that there can be no grace, with impropriety ; or, in other words, that nothing can be graceful that is not adapted to the characters of the person. The graces of a little lively beauty would become ungraceful in a character of majesty, as the majestic airs of an empress would quite destroy the prettiness of the former. The vivacity that adds a grace to beauty in youth would give an additional deformity to old age ; and the very same airs which would be charming on some occasions, may be quite shocking when extremely mis-timed, or expressly misplaced."²

"And yet I cannot think, as some seem inclined to do, that grace consists entirely in propriety ; because propriety is a thing easy enough to be understood, and grace, after all we can say about it, very difficult. Propriety, therefore, and grace are no more one and the same thing than grace and motion are. 'Tis true, it cannot subsist without either ; but then there seems to be something else which I cannot explain, and what I do not know that ever anybody has explained, that goes to the composition ; and which possibly may give it its greatest force and pleasingness."³

"The most celebrated of all the ancient painters was

¹ P. 42.

² Pp. 42 f.

³ P. 43.

Apelles; and the most celebrated of the modern, Raphael. And it is remarkable that the distinguishing character of each of them was grace. . . . Grace has nothing to do with the lowest part of beauty, or colour; very little with shape, and very much with the passions; for it is she who gives their highest zest, and the most delicious part of their pleasingness to the expressions of each of them.”¹

In the *Crito* it does not occur to Spence to take the short step from motion suggested in a painting or a statue, to motion performed or imitated in the dance, or in music, or in poetry, as the most convenient vehicle for the expression of grace. But in the passage quoted from *Polymetis* he clearly sets forth that poetry has greater power than painting or sculpture to express “the quick and uncertain motions of Venus’s eyes,” which motions are certainly graceful, and eminently transitory. Lessing’s arguments on transitoriness and grace prove no more than this.

WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD.

¹ P. 44.

XII.—SOME TEXTS OF LITURGICAL PLAYS.

The purpose of the following pages is merely to present several unpublished texts of liturgico-dramatic offices. Certain of these texts require no special comment, and will take their places naturally alongside similar texts already published. Certain others will, I hope, be welcomed for the new details they offer to the student of mediæval dramatic origins.

I.

The writers who have given us our best accounts of the liturgical plays for Epiphany¹ seem to have overlooked a complete and charming *Officium Stellae* found in a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Mazarine in Paris.² To this text my attention was first called by the article of Monsieur A. Gastoué, *Un petit drame liturgique parisien pour Pâques*,³ in the course of which he writes,

“En dehors des coutumes décrites par Léon Gautier et qui variaient suivant les localités, il est encore d'autres intéressantes. Tel, dans le ms. 1270 de la Mazarine, le ravissant Offices de l'Étoile, représenté à Nevers, au XIe siècle, le matin de l'Epiphanie, qui, au reste, a attiré déjà l'attention des chercheurs (cf. Catalogue des mss. de la Bibliothèque Mazarine).”⁴

¹ H. Anz, *Die lateinischen Magierspiele*, Leipzig, 1905; E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, Oxford, 1903, Vol. II, pp. 44-52; K. A. M. Hartmann, *Über das altspanische Dreikönigspiel*, Leipzig, 1879.

² MS. 1708 (olim 1308).

³ *La Tribune de Saint-Gervais*, 9e Année (1903), pp. 155-156.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 155.

The manuscript indicated in this citation contains no *Officium Stellae*, and Monsieur Gastoué kindly informed me that the codex intended is Mazarine ms. 1708 (*olim* 1308), which is described as "Recueil composé de fragments de mss., d'âge et de provenance diverses." The section of the codex that concerns us (fol. 75^r-109^r) may be described as an abbreviated *Liber Responsalis*,—a list of the "incipits" of the antiphons and responds of the Canonical Office for the liturgical year.² Between the last respond and the *Te Deum* in Matins for Epiphany occurs (fol. 81^v) the text of the *Officium Stellae* presented below.³ The script of the part of the codex under consideration belongs, pretty clearly, to the eleventh century. Regarding the *provenance* of this part of the codex I can determine nothing more definite than that it belonged to a secular⁴ church in France.⁵ The text given below is furnished

¹ A. Molinier, *Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine*, Vol. II, Paris, 1886, p. 175.

² Cf. *id.*, p. 176,—“f. 75-109. Antiennes pour les fêtes de l'année, seulement le début de chaque antienne; au feuillet 81 verso, la Cérémonie de l'Adoration des Mages, avec le texte du dialogue entre l'évêque et les trois enfants figurant les trois rois.”

³ The last respond for Matins of Epiphany,—*Responsorium*: Rex magnus natus est. *Versus*: Reges Tharsis,—occurs at the very bottom of fol. 81^r. The *Officium Stellae* begins at the very top of fol. 81^v.

⁴ For example, Christmas (fol. 78^v) certainly had nine Lessons.

⁵ I am not sure whether or not M. Gastoué, in the passage quoted above, means to associate the present text definitely with the cathedral of Nevers. In any case, no evidence has been given. The saints mentioned in this part of our ms. are French. The words, "domnus presul," in the opening rubric of our text, seem to indicate cathedral usage. The very close agreement of the text, script, and notation of the *Officium Stellae* below with the text, script and notation of the similar *Officium Stellae* in a well known Nevers *Troparium* of the eleventh century (Bibl. Nat. ms. lat. 9449, fol. 17^v-18^r, published by Delisle in *Romania*, IV, 3-4) certainly suggests that our text comes from Nevers.

with neums in the manuscript. One may observe that the particular interest of this text lies in the rubrics, which serve to elucidate one or two texts already published.¹

<OFFICIUM STELLAE>

81^v FINITIS LLECTIONIBUS, LUBEAT DOMNUS PRESUL *prepa-*
RARE TRES CLERICOS IN TRIUM TRANSFIGURATIONE MAGO-
rum, QUOS *preparatos terque* A PRESULE UOCATOS ITA :
Venite! PERGANT ANTE ALTARE HUNC UERSUM DICENTES :

Stella fulgore nimio rutilat,
Que regem regum natum monstrat,
Quem uenturum olim prophetie signauerant.

QUO FINITO, UERSO EORUM UULTU AD POPULUM PERGENT¹
USQUE AD REGEM. DICANT HUNC UERSUM:

Eamus ergo et inquiramus eum, offerentes ei munera :
aurum, thus, *et* myrram.

QUIBUS RESPONDENS REX DICAT:

Regem quem queritis natum esse, quo signo didicistis ;
si illum regnare creditis, dicite nobis.

ADCONTRA IPSI:

Illum natum esse didicimus in oriente stella monstrante.
QUO AUDITO, DICAT ITERUM REX:

Ite et de puero diligenter inuestigate,
Et inuentum redeuntes michi renuntiate.

ACCEPTA LICENTIA PERGANT:

Ecce stella in oriente *preuisa* iterum *preueniet*. Vidi-
mus stellam eius in oriente, et agnouimus regem *regum*
natum esse.

QUIBUS RESPONDEANT CUSTODES ITA:

Qui sunt hi, qui stella duce nos adientes inaudita
ferentes.

¹ For example, Delisle's text mentioned in the preceding note is lacking in rubrics.

ATCONTRA IPSI:

Nos sumus, quos cernitis, reges Tarsis et Arabum et Saba dona ferentes *Xpisto* reginato *Domino*, qui stella deducente uenimus adorare.

OSTENDENTIBUS ILLIS IMAGINEM DICANT:

Ecce puer adest quem queritis. Iam properate, adorate, quia ipse est redemptio uestra.

QUORUM MAGORUM UNUS OFFERENS AURUM DICAT:

Salve, Rex seculorum, suscipe <n>unc¹ aurum.

ET SECUNDUS OFFERENS THUS DICAT:

Tolle thus, tu uerus Deus.

NECNON TERCIVS <OFFERENS> MIRRAM DICAT:

Mirram, signum sepulture.

HIS ITAQUE GESTIS, DICAT PUER STANS IN EXCELSO LOCO:

Impleta sunt omnia que propheticæ dicta sunt. Ite, uiam remeantes aliam, ne delatores tanti regis puniendi eritis.

OMNIBUS PERACTIS, DICAT PRESUL:

Te Deum laudamus.²

II.

Carl Lange, in his indispensable monograph, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern*,³ published eight texts⁴ of the *Officium*

¹ The first letter of this word has been erased.

² This is immediately followed by the rubric: *In Matutinis Laudibus*.

³ Munich, 1887.

⁴ Nos. 87, 88, 89, 91, 93, 94, 95, and 96. Lange assigns also his No. 31 to Paris and to the 17th century. This assignment is evidently wrong, for in the ms. (Bibl. Nat. lat. 9508, Supplément latin 184, saec. xvii) the text in question occurs (fol. 179r) in notes taken "Ex Missale Corbeiensi ms. num. 622, saeculi xi" (fol. 177v). One regrets that Lange's eight texts are presented in the form of incomplete critical notes appended to two very inaccurate texts (pp. 60-62).

Sepulchri that was once celebrated in the Church of Paris. I now offer twelve other similar texts, of the same provenience.

<OFFICIUM SEPULCHRI>

1. FINITO *responsorio*,¹ STATIM debet fieri REPRESENTATIO SEPULCHRI.
2. ANGELI AD MULIERES:
3. Quem queritis in sepulcro, o *Xpisticole*?
4. MULIERES AD ANGELUM:
5. Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.
6. ANGELI:
7. Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
8. ite, nunciate quia surrexit.
9. TUNC UERTANT SE MULIERES AD CHORUM ET UENIANT CANTANDO PROSAM:
10. Victime paschali laudes immolant *Xpistiani*;
11. Agnus redemit oues;
12. *Xpistus* innocens Patri reconciliauit peccatores.
13. Mors et uita duello conflixere mirando;
14. Dux uite mortuus regnat uiuus.
15. TUNC CANTOR STET IN MEDIO CHORI ET DICAT UERSUM:
16. Dic nobis, Maria, quid uidisti in uia?
17. PRIMA MULIER:

¹ All the *Officia Sepulchri* here presented occur immediately after the third respond of Easter Matins, and this respond in all these cases has the following form, which I take from Bibl. Nat. ms. lat. 1293, fol. 113r:—

Responsorium: Et ualde mane una sabbatorum ueniunt ad monumentum, orto iam sole, alleluia. Versus: Et respicientes uiderunt reuolutum lapidem, erat quippe magnus ualde. Orto. Gloria patri. Alleluia. Reincipitur Responsorium: Et ualde.

It should be observed the third respond of Easter Matins was not always *Dum transisset sabbatum*. One might infer the contrary from Chambers, *Mediæval Stage*, II, 25, note 4.

18. Sepulcrum *Xpisti* uiuentis, et gloriam uidi resurgentis.
19. *Secunda MULIER*:
20. Angelicos testes, sudarium et uestes.
21. *TERCIA MULIER*:
22. Surrexit *Xpistus*, spes nostra; *precedet* suos in Galileam.
23. *CANTOR AD CHORUM*:
24. Credendum est magis soli Marie ueraci quam Iudeorum turbe fallaci.
25. *CHORUS*:
26. Scimus *Xpistum* surrexisse a mortuis uere.
27. Tu nobis, uictor, Rex, miserere.
28. *Psalmus*: Te Deum.

Text above from Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 1293, fol. 113^r; Breviarium Parisiense anni 1471.—Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 1294, fol. 88^r; Breviarium Parisiense anni 1472. A.—Bibl. Mazarine, ms. 342 (*olim* 775), fol. 212^r; Breviarium Parisiense saec. xiv. B.—Bibl. Mazarine, ms. 345 (*olim* 246), fol. 296^r; Breviarium Parisiense saec. xv in. C.—Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 745, fol. 80^v; Breviarium Parisiense saec. xiv/xv. D.—Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 1023, fol. 166^r; Breviarium Parisiense saec. xiv. E.—Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 1291, fol. 175^v; Breviarium Parisiense saec. xv in. F.—Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 1025, fol. 219^v; Breviarium Parisiense saec. xiv. G.—Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 746, fol. 151^v; Breviarium Parisiense saec. xiv. H.—Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 746 A, fol. 78^v; Breviarium Parisiense saec. xiv/xv. I.—Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 1292, fol. 124^r; Breviarium Parisiense saec. xv. J.

1. Finito statim debet fieri presentacio sepulchri A; Finito responsorio statim debet fieri presentatio sepulchri B J; Ver-

- sus ad sepulcrum C E; Prosa D; Statim fit representatio sepulchri F I.
2. ad mulieres *wanting* D E; et primo angeli ad mulieres cantando uersum sequentem F I; Angeli ad mulieres cantando H.
 3. Sepulchro A B D E H J.
 4. Mulieres uersus A; Mulieres ad angelum uersum B; Mulieres C E F H I; Mulier D; Mulieres ad angelos G.
 5. crucifixum *wanting* H.
 6. Angeli uersum B G.
 9. prosam *wanting* B; Tunc uertant se mulieres ad chorum et cantant C; Tunc uertant se mulieres ad chorum et cantant prosa<m> D; Tunc uertunt se mulieres ad chorum et cantant sequentia<m> E; Tunc uertant se mulieres ad chorum dicentes prosam F I; Tunc uertant se mulieres et ueniant cantando istam prosam sequentem Prosa G; Tunc uertant se mulieres ad chorum et ueniant cantando prosam sequentem simul Prosa H; Tunc uertant se ad mulieres ad chorum et ueniant cantando prosa<m> J.
 10. *preceded by* Alleluya, resurrexit Dominus hodie, resurrexit leo fortis, Xpistus, filius Dei, Deo gracias dicite eya B; immolent F.
 11. *preceded by* Secunda Maria dicit B; *preceded by* Versus D E G H I.
 12. reconsiliauit F; patris reconciliaui G.
 13. *preceded by* Tercia Maria uersum B; *preceded by* Versus D E G H I.
 15. Tunc cantor stet in medio chori et dicat mulieribus A; Tunc cantor a dextris stet in medio chori et dicat mulieribus uersum B J; Tunc cantor stans in choro dicat mulieribus C; Versus D; Cantor ad mulieres E F; Tunc cantor stet in medio chori et dicat mulieribus uersum G H; Tunc cantor ad mulieres I.
 17. *wanting* H; Prima mulier uersum B G; Prima mulier sola dicat C; Versus D.
 18. et *wanting* A; inuentis B.
 19. Secunda mulier uersum B G J; Secunda mulier dicat C; Versus D; mulier *wanting* F I; *wanting* H.
 21. Tercia mulier uersum B G J; Tercia mulier sola dicat C; *wanting* D H; mulier *wanting* F I.
 22. Galyleam A B G; precedet uos D F; mea precedet uos H.
 23. Cantor A; Cantor ad sinistris ad chorum uersum B; Cantor cum duobus chorum tenentibus dicat ad chorum C; Versus D; Cantor ad chorum uersum G; *wanting* H; Cantor a sinistris ad chorum uersum J.

25. Chorus uersus B G J; Versus D; *wanting* H.
 26. Ex mortuis C D G I.
 27. Tu nobis uictor rex miserere alleluia A D J.
 28. Psalmus *wanting*, Te Deum *preceded by* Versus: Surrexit dominus uere Et apparuit Symoni A; *preceded by* Versus: Surrexit dominus uere Et apparuit Symoni B; *preceded by* Episcopus uel sacerdos C I.

<OFFICIUM SEPULCHRI> ¹

Responsorium: ² Et ualde. *Versus*: Et respicientes.
 Gloria.

ET REINCIPITUR A CANTORE *Responsorium*: Et ualde.
Versus: Surrexit.

AD SEPULCRUM.

ANGELUS AD MULIERES: Quem queritis?

MULIERES: Ihesum.

ANGELI: Non est hic.

TUNC UERTANT SE MULIERES AD CHORUM ET UENIANT
 CANTANDO:

Victime pascali.

Versus: Agnus redemit.

Versus: Mors et uita.

TUNC CANTOR STANS IN CHORO DICAT MULIERIBUS: Dic
 nobis, Maria.

PRIMA MULIER SOLA DICAT UERSUM: Sepulcrum *Xpisti*.

SECUNDA MULIER SOLA DICAT UERSUM: Angelicos testes.

TERCIA MULIER SOLA DICAT UERSUM: Surrexit *Xpistus*.

CANTOR CUM DUOBUS TENENTIBUS CHORUM DICAT AD
 CHORUM uersum: CREDENDUM EST.

CHORUS, uersum: Scimus *Xpistum*.

EPISCOPUS UEL SACERDOS: Te Deum laudamus.

¹Text from Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 978, fol. 24r. Ordo Parisiensis
 Divini Officii recitandi saec. xv.

²The third respond of Easter Matins.

III.

Manuscript cxi in the library of the Museum at Vich, Spain, is a *Troparium-Prosarium* from the Abbey of Pripoll.¹ On palæographical grounds the manuscript may be safely assigned to the eleventh century.²

The liturgico-dramatic texts contained in this manuscript are, I think, of unusual interest. Among other considerations, one may note that the *Unguentarius* is here present in an Easter dramatic office a century or two before the date usually given for his advent.³

The office that occurs under the rubric, *Versus de Pellegrini*<nis>, is unique in the form found here. The latter part,—beginning *Qui sunt hii sermones*,—is especially important in showing an embryonic stage in the development of this office. One should note also that the *Quem quaeritis in sepulchro* formula of Easter occurs in this manuscript both as a trope of the Introit of the Mass and in an *officium* before the *Te Deum* of Matins. The presence of dramatic tropes for the Introit of Ascension and of St. John the Baptist gives additional interest to the document.

¹ I have studied this ms. only through photographs from it in the library of the Community of Solesmes, Quarr Abbey, Isle of Wight. I owe my acquaintance with these photographs entirely to my friend, The Reverend Father Dom G. M. Beyssac, O. S. B., to whom my indebtedness in matters of liturgiology is immeasurable.

² Apparently M. Sablayrolles (*Rivista musica catalana*, December, 1906, pp. 224-226) would assign this ms. to the 10th century. Without evidence this earlier date cannot be accepted (cf. *Rassegna Gregoriana*, VI, 110). See also Florez, *España Sagrada*, Vol. XLIII, Madrid, 1819, pp. 507-8.

³ See Wilmotte, in *Annales Internationales d'Histoire. Congrès de Paris, 1900, 6me Section. Histoire comparée des Littératures*, Paris, 1901, p. 68; Chambers, *Mediæval Stage*, II, 33; L. Wirth, *Die Oster- und Passionspiele bis zum xvi Jahrhundert*, Halle, 1889, p. 5; W. Meyer, *Fragmenta Burana*, Berlin, 1901, pp. 58, 91, 106.

fol. 58^vVERSES PASCALES DE .III. MULIERIBUS.¹

Eamus mirram emere
 Cum liquido aromate,
 Ut ualeamus ungere
 Corpus datum sepulture.
 Omnipotens Pater altissime,
 Angelorum Rector mitissime,
 Quid facient iste miserime!

DICUNT² ANGELIS:

Heu quantus est noster dolor!

Amisimus enim solatium,
 Ihesum Xpistum, Mariae filium,
 Iste nobis erat subsidium.

Heu <quantus est noster dolor!>

Set eamus unguentum emere,
 Quo possimus corpus inungere;
 Non amplius posset³ putrescere.⁴

Heu <quantus est noster dolor!>

Dic tu nobis, <mercator>⁵ iuuenis,
 Hoc unguentum si tu uendide | ris;
 Dic precium, nam iam habueris.

fol. 59^r

Heu <quantus est noster dolor!>

Respondet MERCATOR:

Mulieres michi intendite!
 Hoc unguentum si uultis emere,

¹ Possibly this word may be expanded *Mariis*.² In MS. looks very much like, *dicx*.³ MS., *poscet*.⁴ MS. *putrescire*.⁵ MS. illegible.

Datur genus mirre potencie,
 Quo si corpus possetis ungere
 Non amplius posset ¹ putrescere
 Neque uermes possent comedere.

Hoc unguentum si multum cupitis,
 Unum auri talentum dabit; ²
 Nec aliter *umquam* portabitis.

Respondet MARIA:

O mercator, unguentum libera!
 Ecce tibi <dabi>mus m<un>era!
 Ibimus Xpisti ungere uulnera.

Heu <quantus est noster dolor!>

fol. 59^v

. ² <gau>dia

Deflorent in tristicia
 Cum innocens obrobria
 Fert *et* crucis suspendia
 Iudeorum inuidia
 Et principum perfudia!
 Quid angemus *et* qualia!

Licet, sorores, plangere,
 Plangendo Xpistum querere,
 Querendo corpus ungere,
 Ungendo mente ³ pascere
 De ⁴ fletu, uiso uulnere,
 Dilecto magno federe
 Cor monstratur in opere.

¹ MS., *poscet*, corrected to *posset*.

² Several words are lost at the bottom of fol. 59r, through laceration of this leaf.

³ The musical notation of the text ceases at this point.

⁴ Over this word the MS. has, .a. , for which I have no explanation.

Cordis, sorores, creduli
 Simus et bene seduli,
 Ut nostri cerna<nt> oculi
 Corpus *Xpisti*, uim seculi.
 Quis uoluet petram cumuli
 Magnam siue uim populi?
 Virtus¹ celestis epuli.

Tanta, sorores, uisio
 Splendida (?) et lustrascio
 Nulla sit stupefatio,
 Vobis sit exultatio.
 Mors¹ et mortis occasio
 Moritur uita uicio
 Nostra, surge surreccio.

Hoc, sorores, circuitu,
 Lecto, dicite, sonitu
 Illis¹ qui mesto spiritu
 Et proditio (?) transitu
 Dux uicto surgit obitu
 Querantur lecto strepitu
 . . scis . . dux ortitu

Quid faciemus, sorores,
 Graues ferimus dolores.

Non est nec erit seculis
 Dolor doloris similis

Iesum gentes perimere
 Semper decet nos lugere
 Set ut possimus² gaudere

¹ Over this word the MS. has .a. , for which I have no explanation.

² MS. poscimur.

Eamus tu<m>bam uidere,
 Tumbam querimus non lento,
 Corpus ungamus unguento
 Quod extinctum uulneribus
 Uiuus preualet omnibus
 Regis perhempti preuium
 Plus ualet quam uiuencium
 Cuius amor solacium
 Iuuamen et presidium
 Et per homine subsidium
 Sit nunc et in perpetuum.

fol. 60^r Ubi est Xpistus meus Dominus¹ et filius excelsi.
 Eamus uidere sepulcrum.

Respondet ANGE<LUS>: ²

Quem queritis in sepulcro, Xpisticole?

Respondent MARIA<E>:

Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Respondet ANGEL<US>: ³

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat.

Ite, nunciate quia surrexit dicentes:

Respondent MARIA<E>: ⁴

Alleluia, ad sepulcrum residens angelus nunciat resur-
 <r>exisse Xristum.

Te Deum laudamus.

VERSUS DE PELEGRI<NIS> ⁵

Rex in acubitum iam se contulerat
 Et mea redolens nardus spirauerat

¹ The words, Ubi est Xpistus meus Dominus, occur also at the very bottom of fol. 59^v.

² Margin cut away.

³ Idem.

⁴ Id.

⁵ Id.

fol. 60^v

In . . . <ue | neram> ¹ in quem descenderat
At ille transiens iam declinauerat

Per noctem igitur hunc querens exeo;
Huc illuc transiens nusquam reperio.

ANGELI:

Mulier, quid ploras? Quem queris?

MARIA:

Occurrunt uigiles ardenti studio,
Quos cum transierim sponsum inuenio.

ORTOLANUS:

Mulier, quid ploras? <Q>uem queris?

MARIA:

Tulerunt Dominum meum, et nescio ubi posuerunt eum.

fol. 61^r Si tu | sustulisti eum, dicito michi *et* eum tollam.

ORTOLANUS:

Maria, Maria, Maria!

Respondit MARIA: ²

Raboni, Raboni, Raboni!

MARIA REDIENS DICAT:

Dic, impie Zabule, ualet nunc fraus tua?

DISCIPULI:

Dic nobis, Maria, quid uidisti in uia?

MARIA:

Sepulcrum Xpisti uiuentis,
Et gloriam uidi resurgentis;
Angelicos testes,
Sudarium et uestes.

ANGELI:

Non est hic, sur<r>exit sicut predixerat uobis.

¹ Almost illegible.² Corrected (by a later hand?) from, Item responde Maria.

DISCIPULI:

fol. 61^v Credendum est magis | soli Marie ueraci quam ¹ Iude-
orum turbe fallaci. Scimus Xpistum sur<r>exisse a
mortuis uere. Tu nobis, Xpiste, Rex, miserere.

Qui sunt hii sermones quos confertis ad inuicem ambu-
lantes *et* estis tristes, alleluia.

RESPO<N>DUNT DU<O>: ²

Respondens unus cui nomen Cleophas dixit ei: Tu solus
peregrinus es in Iherusalem *et* non cognouisti que facta
sunt in illa his diebus, alleluia.

Respondet: ²

Quibus ille dixit: Que?

Respondet DU<O>: ²

Et dixerunt: De Ihesu nazareno qui fuit uir propheta
potens in opere *et* sermone coram Deo *et* omni populo,
alleluia. Euouae. ³

fol. 2^r

Versos. ⁴

Ubi est Cristus meus Dominus et filius excelsi?

Eamus uidere sepulcrum, alleluia.

Ad sepulcrum residens angelus nunciat resurrexisse
Cristum.

En ecce completum est illud quod olim ipse *per* pro-
phetam dixerat ad patrem taliter inquiring:

Resurrexi. ⁵

¹ MS., *quomodo*.

² These rubrics are added above the line in a later hand.

³ The rubric, *Versus de Crismate in Ceni Domini*, follows imme-
diately.

⁴ Preceded immediately by the words, "Cristi hodierna," which
may be the *incipit* of the sequence, *Christi hodierna pangimini*
(*Analecta Hymnica*, VII, 42).

⁵ Introit of Easter.

IN RESURRECTIONE.

Ora est, psallite, iubet Dominus canere, eia dicite!

Quem queritis in sepulcro, cristicole?

Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;

ite nunciate quia surrexit dicentes:

Resurrexi.¹

fol. 9v

IN ASCENSA DOMINI.

Quem creditis super astra ascendisse, o celicole?

Responsio: Ihesum qui surrexit de sepulcro, agnicole.

Responsio: Iam ascendit ut predixit: Ascendo ad patrem meum *et* patrem uestrum, Deum meum *et* Deum uestrum.

Responsio: Alleluia, regna, terre, gentes, lingue, decantate Domino quem adorant | celiciues in paterno solio:

fol. 10r

Viri Galilei.²

fol. 19v

IN <NATIUITATE> Sancti IOHANNIS

Quem creditis natum in orbe, o deicole?

Iohannem precursorem ortum de sterili angelo nunciante, o celicole.

fol. 20r

Iam natus est | ut dixit saluator: Mitto angelum meum ante me qui preparet uiam meam.

Eia, psallite omnes cristicole:

De uentre.³

¹ Introit of Easter.

² Introit of Ascension.

³ Introit In Nativitate S. Joannis Baptistae.

IV.

Manuscript Cœnonici Liturg. 325 (19414) in the Bodleian Library at Oxford is a Benedictine *Ordinarium* of the middle of the thirteenth century, of German origin.¹

The interest of the *Officium Sepulchri* from this manuscript arises not only from the text of the dramatic office itself, but also from the fact that in this case the *Officium* was sung in a monastery where at Easter the monastic *cursus* had not given way to the Roman. That is to say, in the present case, Easter Matins has the standard monastic form of twelve Lessons, and not the Roman Easter form of three Lessons so often adopted by monasteries.² We have before us, then, one of the rare examples³ of an *Officium Sepulchri* that was sung *after the twelfth respond*.

¹ See W. H. Frere, *Bibliotheca Musico-Liturgica*, Vol. I, London, 1901, p. 21.

² The present paper is not the place for a discussion of the relations of the *Breviarium Monasticum* to the *Breviarium Romanum*. Concerning these relations, particularly in connection with Easter, I expect to say something elsewhere. I may say in passing that in examining more than two hundred breviaries ranging in date from the 11th century to the 15th, I have found only the following main distinction between the Roman and the monastic Easter *cursus*: the Roman Easter Matins has one single Nocturn of three Lessons, while the monastic Easter Matins has either a single Nocturn of three Lessons, (i. e., the Roman type) or three Nocturns of four Lessons each. I think that Chambers (*Mediæval Stage*, II, 14) must be in error when he speaks of the *Quem quaeritis* office in the *Concordia Regularis* "as forming part . . . of the third Nocturn at Matins on Easter morning." In the *Concordia Regularis* Easter Matins has only three Lessons, and therefore only one Nocturn.

³ Dom Albers (*Revue Bénédictine*, xx, 1903, p. 426), although he seems to have been acquainted only with the few *Officia Sepulchri* published by Martène (*De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus*), infers rightly that this *Officium* was sung more especially in the monasteries that adopted the Roman Easter *cursus*.

<OFFICIUM SEPULCHRI>¹

fol. 82^r *INUITATORIUM*: Aeua, aeua, aeua. *Venite exultemus.*
Ymnus: Te lucis a<uctor>. *Antiphona*: Ego sum qui
 sum. *Psalmus*: Nomine in uirtute. *Versus*: Quem que-
 ris, mulier.

Responsorium: Maria Magdalena. *Versus*: Cito euntes.

Responsorium: Surgens Ihesuc. *Versus*: Surrexit Domi-
 nus.

Responsorium: Congratulamini. *Versus*: Tulerunt Domi-
 num.

Responsorium: Virtute magna. *Versus*: In omnem terram.
 In secundo Nocturno.

Antiphona: Postulaui Patrem meum. *Psalmus*: Dominus
 inluminacio. *Versus*: Tulerunt Dominum meum.

Responsorium: Tulerunt dominum m<eum>. *Versus*:
 Cito euntes.

Responsorium: Expurgate uetus f<ermentum>. *Versus*:
 Non in fermento m<alitia>.

Responsorium: Ecce uicit. *Versus*: Et unus de senioribus.

Responsorium: Isti sunt agni n<ouelli>. *Versus*: In
 omnem t<erram>.

In tertio Nocturno.

Antiphona: Ego dormiui. *Versus*: Noli flere, Maria.

Responsorium: Surrexit pastor. *Versus*: Surrexit Domi-
 nus.

Responsorium:² Angelus Domini. *Versus*: Angelus
 Domini.

Responsorium: Angelus Domini. *Versus*: Ecce precedet.

Responsorium: Dum transisset sabbatum. *Versus*: Et
 ualde mane una s<abbatorum>.

¹ I give the complete text of Easter Matins.

² ms., *Antiphona*, clearly in error.

Duodecimo responsorio IMPOSITO, TRES *presbyteri* SIUE
 DIACONI ALBIS INDUUNTUR *et* CAPPIS, CAPITA UELATA HU-
 MERALIBUS HABENTES, *responsorio* TERCIA UICE FINITO,
 SEPULCHRUM HOC ¹ ORDINE UISITANTES. SINGULI SIN-
 GULA CUM INCENSO TURBIBULA IN MANIBUS TENENTES
 PEDETEMPTIM PROCEDUNT AD SEPULCHRUM CANTANTES
 SUBMISSA UOCE *antiphonam*: Quis reuoluet nobis ab hostio
 lapidem quem tegere sacrum cernimus sepulchrum? QUA
 fol. 82^v FINITA, DUO DIACONI | INDUTI DALMATICIS UELATIS SIMILI-
 TER CAPITIBUS SEDENT INFRA SEPULCHRUM, *quique* STATIM
 QUASI UICE ANGELORUM ILLOS AD IMITATIONEM MULIERUM
 UENIENTES ITA COMPELLANT. ANGELUS DEINTUS *respon-*
sorium: Quem queritis, o tremule mulieres, in hoc tumultu
 gementes? Econtra ISTI, *uersum*: Iesum Nazarenum cru-
 cifixum querimus. ITEM ILLI, *uersum*: Non est hic, quem
 queritis; sed cito euntes nunciate discipulis eius *et* Petro
 quia surrexit Ihesuc. Tunc ISTI INTRANT SEPULCHRUM,
 ILLIS INTERIM CANENTIBUS *antiphonam*: Venite et uidete
 locum ubi positus erat Dominus, *aeuia, aeuia*. THURI-
 FICANT LOCUM UBI CRUX POSITA ERAT, ET TOLLENTES LIN-
 TEUM REPORTANT ILLUT INTER SE EXPANSUM, SIMUL ETIAM
 GESTANTES TURIBULA ET CANTANTES MEDIOCRI UOCE. RE-
 URSE sic A MONUMENTO CANTANT *uersum*: Ad monu-
 mentum uenimus gementes angelum Domini sedentem
 uidimus et dicentem quia surrexit Iesus. Tunc ARMARIUS
 IMPONAT ANTIPHONAM: ² Currebant duo simul. Duo SE-
 NIORES TOLLENTES LINTEAMINA: Cernitis, o socii, ecce lin-
 teamina et sudarium, et corpus non est in sepulchro in-
 uentum. CHORUS CANTAT *antiphonam*: Surrexit enim
 sicut dixit Dominus. QUA AB EIS PERCANTATA IMPONITUR:
 fol. 83^r Te Deum laudamus. Te Dominum. Oratio: Deus qui |
 hodierna die.³

¹ MS., hunc.² MS. has *antiphonam*, twice.³ The rubric, In Matutinis Laudibus, follows immediately.

V.

Codex lat. 9210 in the Vatican Library is described as *Breviarii Passaviensis Pars Aestiva saec. xv*,¹ and contains an *Officium Sepulchri* that may be grouped with several similar texts from Passau already published.² In the present text we are fortunate in having also the *Elevatio Crucifixi*, which is the logical preparation for the *Officium Sepulchri*.

<ELEVATIO CRUCIFIXI ET OFFICIUM SEPULCHRI>³

fol 100^v IN ipsa Sancta Nocte⁴ ante pulsacionem clam surgant, sintque parata tria thuribula cum thure et mirra et thymiamate. Et decanus uel alius sacerdos cum senioribus clericis, et summa diligencia accedant ad sepulcrum, et stantes cantent psalmos: Domine, probasti me, et, Domine, quid multi<plicati>, et thurificent ymaginem crucifixi, sublatamque de sepulcro secum portent super aram cantando humili uoce responsorium: Surrexit pastor bonus. Versus: Surrexit Dominus de sepulchro; deinde antiphonam: Xpistus resurgens, et cooperiatur linteamine. Quibus finitis, stantes ante altare et mutua caritate se inuicem deosculentur dicentes: Surrexit Dominus uere, alleluia. Et apparuit Symoni Petro, alleluia. Dicatur una oratio de Resurrectione.

STATIMQUE FIAT PULSACIO. CONUENIENTIBUS omnibus

¹ H. Ehrensberger, *Libri Liturgici Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae*, Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1897, pp. 266-267.

² See Lange, Nos. 174, 175, 176, 178, 187, 188, 189, 190.

³ Bibl. Vaticana ms. lat. 9210, fol. 100^v-103^r.

⁴ Before Matins of Easter morning.

IN CHORUM DICAT SACERDOS QUI CELEBRATURUS EST SOLITO MORE: *Domine labia mea aperies, ET, Deus in adiutorium. CANTORES INCIPIANT Invitatorium: Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.*¹

fol. 102^r *Responsorium:*² *Dum transisset sabbatum, Maria Magdalena, et Maria Jacobi et Salomee emerunt aromata, ut uenientes ungerent Ihesum, alleluia, alleluia. Versus: Et ualde mane una sabbatorum ueniunt ad monumentum, orto iam sole. Ut. Gloria Patri. Responsorium REPETATUR, ET FIAT PROCESSIO IN ECCLESIAM, OMNES PORTANTES CEREOS ACCENSOS. DYACONUS QUI LEGIT EUANGELIUM UEL ALTER QUI HABEAT UOCEN APTAM ACTURUS OFFICIUM ANGELI PRECEDAT SEDEATQUE IN DEXTRA PARTE AD CAPUT COOPERTUM STOLA CANDIDA. ORDINATA STACIONE ET FINITO RESPONSORIO, CANTORES INCIPIANT ANTIPHONAM: Maria Magdalena et alia Maria ferebant diluculo aromata Dominum querentes in monumento, CHORO PROSEQUENTE. INTERIM DUO SACERDOTES UEL TRES CUM TOTIDEM THURRIBULIS FIGURAM MULIERUM TENENTES PROCEDANT UERSUS SEPULCRUM, ET STANTES CANTENT ANTIPHONAM:*

*Quis reuoluet nobis ab hostio lapidem quem tegere*³ *sanctum cernimus sepulcrum?*

ANGELUS SEDENS IN DEXTRA PARTE SEPULCRI COOPERTUS STOLA CANDIDA RESPONDEAT:

Quem queritis, o tremule mulieres, in hoc tumulo gementes.

MULIERES:

fol. 102^v *Ihesum Nazarenum | crucifixum querimus.*

¹ I omit Matins, which is of the usual Roman type,—one Nocturn of three Lessons.

² Third respond of Matins.

³ MS., *tegeret*.

ANGELUS:

Non est hic, quem queritis, sed cito euntes nunciate discipulis eius, et Petro, quia surrexit Ihesuc.

ET CUM CEPERIT ANGELUS CANTARE, Sed cito euntes, MULIERES THURIFICANT SEPULCRUM ET FESTINANTER REDEANT ET UERSUS CHORUM STANTES CANTENT *antiphonam*:

Ad monumentum uenimus gementes, angelum Domini sedentem uidimus et dicentem quia surrexit Ihesuc.

QUA FINITA, CHORUS INPONAT *antiphonam*:

Currebant duo simul, et ille alius discipulus precucurrit cicius Petro, et uenit prior ad monumentum, alleluia.

ET DUO QUASI PETRUS ET IOHANNES CURRANT, precurratque IOHANNES SEQUENTE¹ PETRO; ET UENIANT AD MONUMENTUM, AUFERANT LINTHEAMINA ET SUDARIUM QUIBUS INUOLUTA ERAT YMAGO DOMINI, ET UERTENTES SE AD CHORUM OSTENDENDO EA CANTENT:

Cernitis, o socii, ecce lintheamina et sudarium, et corpus non est in sepulchro inuentum.

POST HEU CHORUS CANTENT HUNC *uersum*:

Dic nobis, Maria, quid uidisti in uia?

TUNC UENIENS² AD MEDIUM UNUS LOCO MARIE MAGDALENE DICAT:

Sepulchrum Xpisti uiuentis, et gloriam uidi resurgentis.

ITERUM CHORUS:

Dic nobis, Maria.

Maria respondeat:

Angelicos testes, sudarium et uestes.

ITERUM CHORUS:

Dic nobis, Maria.

Maria:

fol. 103^r Surrexit Xpistuc, spes mea; precedet | suos in Galy-
lea<m>.

¹ MS., sequentem.

² MS., uenientes.

CHORUS:

Credendum est magis soli Marie ueraci quam Iudeorum turbe fallaci. Scimus Xpistum surrexisse ex mortuis uere. Tu nobis uictor, Rex, miserere.

QUO FINITO, CANTORES INCIPIANT:

Te Deum laudamus.

POPULUS CANTET:

Christ ist erstanden.

ET RECEDANT AD CHORUM. CANTORES PORREGANT CLERO INCENSUM DICENTES TACITA UOCE: *Surrexit Xpistuc. CLERUS RESPONDEAT: Gaudeamus, ET INUICEM SE ADOSCU- LANTUR.*¹

VI

The *Officium Sepulchri* found in ms. lat. 1310 of the Bibliothèque Nationale,—Breviarium ad usum ecclesiae Sancti Martini Wormatiensis saec. xv,²—offers no peculiarities and requires no comment.³

<OFFICIUM SEPULCHRI>⁴

fol. 198^v *Responsorium:*⁵ *Dum transisset sabbatum, Maria Magdalene et Maria Iacobi et Salome emerunt aromata, ut uenientes ungerent Ihesum, alleluia, alleluia. Versus: Et ualde mane una sabbatorum ueniunt ad monumentum*

¹ The *Versus Sacerdotales* and Lauds follow immediately.

² See *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae*, Vol. III, Paris, 1744, p. 102.

³ With this text should be compared that published by Lange (*Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, xli, 82), from British Museum Additional ms. 19415, Breviarium ad usum ecclesiae Wormatensis, fol. 327r.

⁴ From Bibl. Nat., ms. lat. 1310, Breviarium ad usum ecclesiae Sancti Martini Wormatiensis, fol. 198^v-199r.

⁵ Third respond of Easter Matins.

orto iam sole. Ut ueni<entes>. IN UISITACIONE SEPUL-
CHRI CANTATUR *predictum* RESPONSORIUM, ET TUNC SCO-
LARES CANTANT *Antiphonam*:

Quis reuoluet nobis lapidem ab ostio monumenti, alle-
luia?

TUNC RESPONDET QUIDAM IN FORMA ANGELI:

fol. 199^r | Quem queritis in sepulchro, o *Xpisticole*?

RESPONDE<N>T UISITATORES:

Ihesum Nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

RESPONDET ANGELUS:

Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite nunciate quia surrexit de sepulchro.

ITEM ANGELUS:

Venite et uidete locum ubi positus erat Dominus, alle-
luia, alleluia.

TUNC CONCERTANT SE UISITANTES AD POPULUM, ALTA VOCE
CANTANTES HANC *Antiphonam*:

Antiphona: Surrexit Dominus de sepulchro qui pro nobis
pependit in ligno, alleluia.

DEINDE SEQUITUR: Te Deum.¹

VII.

Codex Palatino 525 of the Vatican Library,—Brevi-
arium Benedictinum Fuldense saec. xv,²—contains a short
but interesting *Officium Sepulchri*, which was sung at the
end of the Roman form of Easter Matins so often adopted
in monastic churches.³

¹ Lauds follow immediately. .

² See Ehrensberger, pp. 214-215.

³ See above, No. iv.

<OFFICIUM SEPULCHRI>¹

fol. 208^v *Responsorium*:² *Dum transisset*³ *Sabbatum, Maria Magdalena et Maria Iacobi et Salomee emerunt aromata, ut uenientes ungerent Ihesum, alleluia, alleluia. Versus: Et ualde mane una Sabbatorum ueniunt ad monumentum orto iam sole. Ut. Gloria. Dum transisset.*

AD SEPULCRUM.

Quem queritis in sepulcro, o Xpisticole?

Versus: Ihesum Nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

Versus: Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;

fol. 209^r *ite, nunciate | quia surrexit de sepulchro.*

Surrexit Dominus de sepulchro, qui pro nobis pependit in ligno, alleluia.

CHORUS: Deo gratias, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.

*Te Deum laudamus.*⁴

VIII.

In ms. 448 of the Stiftsbibliothek at St. Gallen we are fortunate in having not only a highly developed version of the *Officium Sepulchri*, but also the related offices, *Depositio Crucis* and *Elevatio Crucis*. The codex can with certainty be assigned to the early years of the fifteenth century, and the section of it from which I have taken

¹ Rome, Bibl. Vatic., ms. Palatino 525, fol. 208^v-209^r,—*Breviarium Benedictinum Fuldense saec. xv.*

² Third respond of Easter Matins.

³ ms., *transisset*.

⁴ The rubric, *Laudes*, follows immediately.

the texts below is thus accounted for in the official description:¹

“S. 50-139: ‘Incipit registrum sec. ord. et chor. monast. Hirsfeld.’” I believe this to be an unfair representation of the facts. The general rubric for the section of the codex in question is written in red as follows:

“In nomine Domine, Amen, incipit registrum secundum ordinem et chorum monasterii Sancti Galli.”² Over the words, “Sancti Galli” of this rubric a later hand, possibly of the fifteenth century, has written in black ink a word that seems to read, “hirsfeldestū.” Clearly the original rubric assigned the “Registrum”³ to St. Gallen.⁴ There is abundant additional evidence for associating this codex with St. Gallen, such as the following entries in the Calendar (pp. 3-14):

Festiuitas Sancti Galli confessoris (p. 12);

Dedicacio Capelle Sancti Galli (p. 12);

Festiuitas Sancti Othmari abbatis (p. 13).

<DEPOSITIO CRUCIFIXI>⁵

p. 102 AD Vesperas.⁶ Antiphona: Repleuit et inebriauit.
Habens CALICEM in MANIBUS DEINDE IMPONAT CANTOR

¹ See G. Scherer, *Verzeichniss der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen*, Halle, 1875, p. 147.

² MS. 448, p. 50.

³ I should prefer to call this section of the MS. an *Ordinarium Monasticum*.

⁴ In another place I propose to add certain St. Gall. texts to those printed by Lange (p. 22). The five texts from St. Gall. MSS. given by Lange are hardly reliable as they stand, for the reader has no hint that in four cases,—MS. 374, 387, 388, 391,—the *Quem quaeritis* formula occurs in the midst of a regular Procession, of which it becomes an integral part, and that the fifth text,—from MS. 384,—is in the MS. very uncertain both as to its composition and as to its position in the proper liturgical text.

⁵ St. Gall MS. 448, p. 102.

⁶ Vespers of Good Friday.

Psalmum: Confitebor, ij TONALITER, *Psalmum*: Domine probasti, *Psalmum*: Eripe me, *Psalmum*: Domine clamaui, *Psalmum*: Voce mea. STATIM SUPER MAGNIFICAT ANTI-PHONA: Cum accepisset. Antiphona FINITA, OMNES ASCENDUNT CIRCA ALTARE, ET DOMINUS ABBAS EXUENS CASULAM, STANTES ANTE CRUCEM AD DEXTRUM ¹ CORNU ALTARIS, CANTANTES *responsorium*: Ecce quomodo, SUBMISSA VOCE. *Versus*: In pace factus. REPETICIO: Et erit. POST<EA> ACCIPIENTES CRUCEM DOMINUS ABBAS ET SENIORES PORTANTES AD SEPULCHRUM CANTANTES *responsorium*: Sicut ouis. *Versus*: In pace. REPETICIO: Traditus. INTERIM PONENT CRUCEM IN SEPULCHRO ET CLAUDUNT EUM, PONENTES ANTE SEPULCHRUM QUATUOR LUMINA IUGITER ARDENTIA, CANTANTES *responsorium*: Sepulto Domino. *Versus*: Ne forte. REPETICIO: Ponentes mi<lites.> DEINDE DOMINUS ABBAS DICAT *Versum*: In pace factus est locus eius. COLLECTA: Respice Domine. ET ASPERGENS SEPULCRUM AQUA BENEDICTA, ET THURIFICETUR CUM INCENSU, ET MISSE SUNT.

<ELEVATIO CRUFIXI OFFICIUM SEPULCHRI>²

p. 105 ORDO AD LEVANDUM CRUCEM sanctam in SACRATISSIMA NOCTE PASCALI.

PARUM ANTE MATUTINAS DOMINUS ABBAS, PREPOSITUS DECANUS, CUSTOS ET SENIORES AD HOC DEPUTATI SURGANT DILUCULO ET INDUUNT SE ALBIS ET CAPPIS PERGENTES CUM SUMMA REUERENCIA CUM MINISTRIS PORTANTES AQUAM BENEDICTAM CUM INCENSU ET CUM SILENCIO AD SEPULCRUM. ET DOMINUS ABBAS CUM SUMMO HONORE TOTAQUE DEUOTIONE FLEXIS GENIBUS DEPONAT SUDARIUM ET LINTEAMINA CUM QUIBUS SANCTA CRUX EST INUOLUTA ET AS-

¹ MS., dextram.

² St. Gall. MS. 448, pp. 105-106.

PERGENS AQUA BENEDICTA ET THURIFICETUR CUM INCENSU ET CANTENT SUBMISSA VOCE: *Xpiste, salus rerum. Versus: Pollicitam, usque Surge, sepulte meus. Et elevantes CRUCEM de SEPULCHRO CANTENT HOS UERSUS: Solue cathenatus. Versus: Redde tuam faciem. Quibus finitis, cantatur antiphona: Cum rex glorie, submissa voce portantes CRUCEM ANTE CHORUM in MONASTERIO. Antiphona FINITA, CANTANT ANTIPHONAM: Attollite portas prin<cipes>, TRIBUS UICIBUS, PULSANTES CONTRA IANUAM cum PEDE CRUCIS in SIGNUM REDEMPCIONIS ANIMARUM EX LIMBO. AD ISTUM PULSUM IANUA APERITUR. Postea PONATUR CRUX ANTE ALTARE Beate Virginis, Panno SUPPOSITO AC LUMINE ACCENSO, UT A POPULIS ADORETUR. DEINDE Dominus ABBAS DICA<T> UERSUM: In resurrectione tua, Xpiste. Collecta: Presta, quesumus, omnipotens Deus. Hys finitis, ADORENT CRUCEM OSCULANDO AC RIGANDO LACRIMIS UULNERA EIUS. ET TUNC FIAT COMPULSACIO OMNIUM CAMPANARUM PULSANTQUE TRIBUS UICIBUS in SIGNUM RESURRECTIONIS.*

POST HOC PULSANTUR MATUTINE. IN DIE PASCE ANTE MATUTINAS FIAT TRINA ORATIO. Post ULTIMUM SIGNUM INCIPIAT Dominus ABBAS: Domine labia mea aperies. Deus in adiutorium, cum Gloria Patri. DEINDE DUO SENIORES CANTENT INUITATORIUM INDUTI CAPPIS FESTIVALIBUS: Alleluia, Xpistum re<surrexisse>. Psalmum: Venite, cum SUMMA REUERENCIA. Quibus finitis, CANTOR INCIPIENS ANTIPHONAM in PRIMO NOCTURNO: Ego sum. Psalmus: Beatus uir. Antiphona: Postulaui Patrem. Psalmus: Quare fre<muerunt>. Antiphona: Ego dormiui. Psalmus: Domine, quid multi<plicati>. Versus: Quid queris mulier. Pater noster. Et ne nos. Versus: Exaudi, Domine. DYACONUS INDUTUS DALMATICA LEGENS p. 106 PRIMAM | Lectionem de Euangelio: Maria Magdalena. Responsorium: Angelus Domini. DEHINC UNUS EX SENI-

ORIBUS LEGAT SECUNDAM *Lectionem*. *Responsorium*: Angelus Domini. DOMINUS ABBAS LEGENS TERTIAM *Lectionem*. *Responsorium*: Dum transisset.

INTERIM PREPARANT SE TRES HONESTE PERSONE ORDINATI AD HOC, INDUENTES SE TRIBUS CAPPIS IN SIGNUM MARIE MAGDALENE, JACOBI ET SALOME. ET DUO PUERI PORTANT DUO LUMINA POSITA SUPER BACULOS PRECEDENTES EOS. ACCEDENTES ANTE CHORUM, *responsorio* FINITO, PRIMA MARIA CANTAT *versum*:

Heu nobis;

ALTERA MARIA:

Iam percusso,

STANTES ANTE CHORUM. DEINDE INTRANTES CHORUM ACCEDENTES AD SEPULCHRUM, TERCIA MARIA CANTAT:

Sed eamus.

VERSU FINITO, CHORUS CANTAT *antiphonam*: Maria Magdalena. INTEREA PROCEDUNT AD SEPULCRUM, IBIQUE STANTES CANTENT:

Quis reuoluet?

ANGELI SEDENTES IN SEPULCHRO RESPONDENT:

Quem queritis?

MARIE:

Ihesum Nazarenum.

ITEM ANGELI:

Non est hic,

SUBIUNGENTES *antiphonam*:

Venite et uidete.

MARIE CONUERTUNT SE AD CHORUM INCIPIENTES ET CANTANTES *antiphonam*:

Ad monumentum uenimus.

RESPONDENT PEREGRINI STANTES IN MEDIO CHORI ANTE PRIMOS GRADUS *ymnium*:

Ihesu nostra redemptio,

PRIMUM *uersum* CANTANTES. CHORUS:

Que te uicit.

Versus: Gloria tibi, Domine, qui surrexit¹ a mortuis.

DEINDE CHORUS:

Currebant duo simul.

INTEREA ASCENDUNT PEREGRINI AD SEPULCHRUM ACCIPI-
ENTES SUDARIUM, DESCENDENTES AD CHORUM OSTENDENTES
SUDARIUM ET CANTENT:

Cernitis, o socii.

QUO FACTO CONUERTUNT SE MARIE AD ALTARE. MARIA
MAGDALENA CANTAT:

Dolor crescit, ET
Cum uenissent, ET
En lapis.

INTERIM ASCENDENS DOMINICA PERSONA RUBEA CASULA
INDUTUS AD DEXTRUM CORNU ALTARIS HABENS UEXILLUM
IN MANU, ET CONUERTAT SE MARIA MAGDALENA AD EUM
CANTANS TRIBUS UICIBUS:

Heu redemptio Israel,
FLEXIS GENIBUS. DOMINICA PERSONA RESPONDIT:
Maria!

Item ILLA:

Domine, si tu sustulisti.

DOMINICA PERSONA:

Maria!

Item MARIA:

Rab<on>i!

DEINDE DOMINICA PERSONA:

Prima quidem.

Item MARIA:

Sanctus Deus,

CUM GENUFLEXIONIBUS. DOMINICA PERSONA:

Hic priori.

¹ MS., surrect.

MARIA:

Sancte fortis.

DOMINICA PERSONA:

Ergo noli me.

MARIA:

Sancte et immortalis.

DOMINICA PERSONA:

Nunc ignoras.

QUIBUS FINITIS, CHORUS CANTAT SEQUENCIAM:

Victime.

Versus: Agnus rede<mit>.

Versus: Mors et uita.

DEINDE PEREGRINI STANTES ANTE GRADUS IN MEDIO CHORI
CANTENT UERSUM:

Dic nobis, Maria.

MARIE RESPONDENT:

Sepulchrum Xpisti ui<uentis>.

Angelicos testes.

Versus: Scimus Xpistum, ET CETERA.

HIJS FINITIS, DOMINICA PERSONA ET MARIE STANTES ANTE
ALTARE CANTENT UERSUM:

Dicant nunc,

CHORO RESPONDENTE:

Qui enim uiuit.

DEINDE MARIE CANTENT ANTIPHONAM:

Surrexit Dominus de sepulchro.

POST HOC UNIVERSUS POPULUS CUM MAGNA LETICIA CAN-
TANT:

Crist ist erstanden,

POSTEA CANTOR INCIPIENS:

Te Deum laudamus.

Versus: In resurrectione tua, Xpiste. COLLECTA DE FESTO.
SEQUUNTUR LAUDES.

IX.

Codex 289 (*olim* C. 153) in the National Library in Madrid¹ is a *Troparium-Prosarium* of the twelfth century, written for use in Sicily.² Since the manuscript is dramatically so rich as to contain an *Officium Stella*, an *Officium Sepulchri*, and an *Officium Peregrinorum*, one is disappointed in finding no independent *Officium Pastorum*, a form of which, however, is clearly present in the *Officium Stellae* below.

<OFFICIUM STELLAE>³fol. 107^vVERSUS AD HERODEM FACIENDUM.⁴

<PRIMUS DICAT>:

Stella fulgore nimio rudilat.

ALIUS DICAT:

Que regem regum natum monstrat.

¹ I know this ms. only through photographs from it at Quarr abbey, Isle of Wight, to which The Reverend Father Dom Beyssac called my attention. I am very happy to announce that in the near future Dom Beyssac will publish the dramatic offices from this ms. *with their musical notation*. Since the medium of publication employed by Dom Beyssac will not be generally accessible to American scholars, he very generously suggests that I publish these texts independently. Dom Beyssac is not responsible for my readings.

² J. F. Riaño (*Critical and Bibliographical Notes on Early Spanish Music*, London, 1887, p. 59) says that this ms. is written "in characters of the xivth century,"—a date that is palæographically impossible. I assign the ms. to the use of Sicily upon the authority of Dom Beyssac, who finds in the *Sanctorale* evidence for this assignment.

³ Madrid ms. 289 (*olim* C. 153), fol. 107^v-110^r.

⁴ Preceded in the ms. by the *Te Deum*, which follows the *Liber Generationis* at the end of Matins on Epiphany.

TER<T>IUS:

Quem uenturum olim prophecie signauerant.

PRIMUS:

fol. 108^r Venite.

ALIUS:

Venite.

TERCIUS:

Venite adoremus eum, quia ipse est Dominus Deus noster.

TUNC IUNGANT SE SIMUL *et* DICANT:

Eamus ergo *et* inquiramus eum offerentes ei munera, aurum, thus *et* mirram, quia scriptum didicimus: Adorabunt eum omnes reges, omnes gentes seruiant ei.

NUNCIUS AD HERODEM:

Salve, rex Iudeorum. Eni magi ueniunt *et* regem regum stella duce natum requirunt.

HERODES AD NUNCIUM:

Anteuenire iube, quo possim singula scire,

Qui sint, cur ueniant, quo nos rumore requirunt.

NUNCIUS AD MAGOS:

Regia uos mandata uocant; non segniter ite.

MAGI AD HERODEM:

Israhelitarum rex fortis uiuat in euum.

fol. 108^v HERODES AD MAGOS:

Quem queritis, aduene?

MAGI:

Regem Iudeorum natum querimus.

HERODES:

Regem quem queritis natum esse quo signo didicistis?

MAGI:

Illum natum esse didicimus in oriente stella monstrante.

HERODES:

Si illum regnare creditis, dicite nobis.

MAGI:

Hunc regnare fatentes cum mysticis muneribus.
De terra longinqua adorare uenimus
Trinum Deum uenerantes tribus in muneribus.

UNUS DICAT:

Auro regem.

ALIUS:

Thure sacerdotem.

TERCIUS:

Mirra mortalem.

HERODES AD NUNCIOS:

Huc, simiste mei, dissertos pagina scribas
Prophetica ad me uocate.

NUNCIUS AD SCRIBAS:

fol. 109^r Vos legis periti | a rege uocati
Cum prophetarum libris properando uenite.

SCRIBE AD HERODEM:

Salue, rex Iudeorum.

HERODES:

O uos scribe, interrogati dicite si quid de hoc puero
scriptum uideritis in libris.

SCRIBE AD HERODEM:

Vidimus, Domine, in prophetarum lineis nasci Xpistum
in Bethleem, ciuitate Daud, Ysaia sic uaticinante: Beth-
leem, non eris minima in principibus Iuda; ex te enim
exiet dux qui regat populum meum Israhel, ipse enim
saluum faciet populum suum a peccatis eorum.

HERODES AD MAGOS:

Ite *et* de puero diligenter inuestigate,
Et inuentum redeuntes michi renunciate,
Ut *et* ego ueniens adorem eum.

MAGI AD PASTORES:

109^v Pastores, dicite quidnam uidistis, *et* annunciate Xpisti
natiuitatem.

PASTORES AD MAGOS:

Infantem uidimus pannis inuolutum *et* choros angelorum laudantes saluatorem.

MAGI:

Ecce stella in oriente preuisa
Iterum preedit nos lucida,
Quam Balaam ex iudaica
Orituram dixerat prosapia;
Que nostrorum oculos
Fulguranti lumine perstrixit pauidos.

OBSTETRICES:

Qui sunt hi qui stella duce nos adeuntes inaudita ferunt.

MAGI:

Nos sumus, quos cernitis, reges Tharsis *et* Arabum *et* Saba dona ferentes Xpisto regi nato domino, quem stella deducente adorare uenimus.

OBSTETRICES:

Ecce puer adest quem queritis. Iam properate *et* ad-
110^r rate quia ipse est redemp|tio nostra.

PRIMUS DICAT:

Salve, Deus Deorum.

SECUNDUS:

Salve, princeps seculorum.

TERCIUS:

Salve, uita mortuorum.

PRIMUS:

Suscipe, Rex, aurum.

SECUNDUS:

Tolle thus, tu uere Deus.

TERCIUS:

Mirram, signum sepulture.

ANGELUS:

Impleta sunt omnia que propheticæ dicta sunt; ita uia remeantes alia, ne delatores tanti regis puniendi sitis.

Nuncium uobis fero de supernis: natus est Xpistus dominator orbis in Bethlehem Iude, sic enim propheta dixerat ante.

Te Deum laudamus.¹

<OFFICIUM SEPULCHRI>²

fol. 115^v MULIERES:

Quis reuoluet nobis lapidem ab hostio monumenti?

PUEBI: Venite.

fol. 116^r CLERICI: Quis re | uoluet?

PUEBI: Venite.

CLERICI: Quis reuoluet?

PUEBI: Venite, nolite timere uos.

Quem queritis in sepulchro, o Xpisticole?

CLERICI: Iesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

PUEBI: Non est hic, surrexit sicut predixerat;
ite, nunciate quia surrexit.

CLERICI: Alleluia, surrexit Dominus hodie, surrexit
leo fortis, Xpistus filius Dei.

CHORUS: Deo gracias, dicite eia.

Te Deum laudamus.³

<OFFICIUM PEREGRINORUM>⁴

fol. 117^r DE PEREGRINO IN DIE LUNE PASCHE HOC DICAT CHORUS:

Iesu, nostra redemptio,
Que te uicit clemencia.

¹ Followed immediately by the Farced Epistle for Epiphany, beginning,—*Deus ante tempora gentibus*.

² Madrid ms. 289 (*olim* C. 153), fol. 115^v-116^r. In the ms. the office is preceded by the *Benedictio Cefsei* of Holy Saturday. The office has no introductory rubric.

³ Followed immediately by the Farced Epistle for Easter, beginning, *Regis perhennis glorie pangit*.

⁴ Madrid ms. 289 (*olim* C. 153), fol. 117^r-118^v.

DUO CLERICI INDUTI CAPPIS DICANT:

Tercia dies est quod hec facta sunt.

PEREGRINUS:

Qui sunt hii sermones quos confortis adinuicem ambulantes, *et* estis tristes, alleluia, alleluia?

DISCIPULI:

Tu solus peregrinus es in Ierusalem, *et* non cognouisti que facta sunt in illa his diebus, alleluia.

PEREGRINUS:

Que?

DISCIPULI:

fol. 117^v De Iesu nazareno, qui fuit uir | propheta potens in opere *et* sermone coram Deo *et* omni populo, alleluia, alleluia, *et* quo modo tradiderunt eum summi sacerdotes in dampnatione mortis, alleluia.

PEREGRINUS:

O stulti *et* tardi corde ad credendum in omnibus his que locuti sunt prophete, alleluia: Nonne sic oportuit pati Xpistum *et* ita intrare in gloriam suam, alleluia?

CHORUS:

Cum autem appropinquaret castello quo ibant, ipse se finxit longius ire *et* coegerunt illum ut remaneret cum eis.¹

DISCIPULI:

Mane nobiscum quoniam aduesperascit *et* inclinata est iam dies, alleluia.

² PEREGRINUS:

Michi longum iter restat, alleluia.

DISCIPULI: ²

118, Sol uergens ad occasum suadet, ut nostrum uelit hospi-

¹ In the MS. there is a blank space between *eis* and *Discipuli*.

² — ² has no musical notation. This passage may possibly belong before the rubric, *Discipuli*, of the preceding speech. In the MS. there is a blank space (erasure?) between this rubric, *Discipuli*, and the preceding word, *eis*.

cium, placent enim nobis sermones tui quos refers de resurrectione magistri nostri, alleluia.

CHORUS:

Et intrauit cum illis, *et* factum est dum recumberet cum eis accepit panem, benedixit ac fregit *et* porrigebat illis, *et* cognouerunt illum in fractione panis, *et* ipse euauit ab oculis eorum, alleluia.

ET ITA TENENDO IN MEDIO EORUM PEREGRINUM UENIANT USQUE AD ALTARE, AC IBI SIT PARATA MENSA CUM PANE *et* UINO, *et* DISCUMBANT ET FRANGAT PANEM EISQUE DET, AC POSTEA AB OCULIS EORUM EUANESCAT. TUNC DICANT DISCIPULI:

Nonne cor nostrum ardens erat in nobis de Ihesu, dum loqueretur nobis in uia *et* aperiret nobis scripturas. Heu, miseri, ubi erat sensus noster, quo intellectus abierat, alleluia?

ET ITERUM EIS SE OSTENDENS DICAT:

1187 Pax uobis, ego sum. Nolite timere; uidete manus meas *et* pedes meos, quia ego ipse sum. Palpate *et* uidete, quia spiritus carnem *et* ossa non habent sicut me uidetis habere, alleluia, alleluia.

DISCIPULI UERSUS CHORUM DICANT:

Surrexit Dominus de sepulchro, qui pro nobis pependit in ligno, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.

CHORUS:

Deo gracias, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.¹

KARL YOUNG

¹ Followed immediately by the rubric, *In Ascensione Domini*.

XIII.—FORTUNE'S WHEEL IN THE *ROMAN DE LA ROSE*.

The wheel as an attribute of Fortune is of Roman origin,¹ and, together with the globe which often takes its place, signifies the inconstancy of the goddess. In Roman art the wheel or globe is represented as being held in the hand of the goddess, or lying at her feet; she is sometimes represented as standing on the globe. Motion of the wheel is not implied in its postures.²

In Latin literature previous to the middle ages the references to the globe or wheel as attributes of Fortune are few in number, the earliest of them being seemingly that of Pacuvius (second century B. C.):³ “*Fortunam insanam esse et cæcam et brutam perhibent philosophi saxoque instare in globoso prædicant volubili.*” Cicero (first century B. C.) writes in *Piso*, 10, 22: “*cumque ipse nudus in convivio saltaret in quo cum illum saltatorium versaret orbem ne tum quidem fortunæ rotam pertimescebat.*” Tibullus (first century B. C.), I, 5, 70: “*versatur celeri Fors levis orbe rotæ.*” Fronto (second century A. D.), *Orat.*, p. 157: “*omnes Fortunas . . . cum pennis, cum rotis, cum gubernaculo reperias.*” Ammianus Marcellinus (fourth century A. D.), XXVI, 8, 3: “*quod quivis beatus versa rota Fortunæ.*” Boethius (sixth century A. D.), *De consolatione philosophiæ*, prose I: “*Tu vero volventis rotæ inpetum retinere conaris? At omnium mor-*

¹ Cf. Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, tome deuxième, deuxième partie, Paris, 1896, p. 1277.

² Cf. e. g. Reinach, *Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine*, tome II, p. 263.

³ P. 104 Rib. Cf. *P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus De Oratoribus*, ed. by Alfred Gudeman, Boston, 1894, p. 246.

talium stolidissime, si manere incipit, fors esse desistit ;” and prose II : “Hæc nostra vis est, hunc continuum ludum ludimus: rotam volubili orbe versamus, infima summis, summa infimis mutare gaudemus. Adscende si placet, sed ea lege, ne, cum ludicri mei ratio poscet, descendere iniuriam putes.” It is noteworthy that although Roman art did not place Fortune’s wheel in postures which would imply that it revolved, several of the references to it in Latin literature mention its motion.

Mediæval art maintained the tradition of Fortune with her wheel, but elevated the wheel from the position of a mere symbol of mutability in general to that of an allegorical agency for elevating and debasing mankind. Fortune is represented as seated upon a stool, and turning a wheel placed before her. In most cases various types of humanity are depicted as tied to the wheel.¹ This change is but one of the phenomena for which were responsible the loss of the æsthetic sense generally in the middle ages, and the accompanying change in expression from the abstract to the concrete. Given this change from delicate symbolism to crude realism in pictorial representations of Fortune and her wheel, we shall expect to find an accompanying change in mediæval literature.

Guillaume de Lorris mentions Fortune’s wheel but once, *Roman de la Rose* (Michel ed.), vv. 4590–4599 :

“Ce est ausinc cum de Fortune
 Qui met ou cuer des gens rancune ;
 Autre hore les aplane et chue,
 En poi d’ore son semblant mue.
 Une hore rit, autre hore est morne,
 Ele a une roe qui torne,

¹ See Du Sommerard, *Les Arts au moyen âge*, Album, vol. VI, series 4, plates 37–40. Cf. Mátzke, “To take time by the forelock,” *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn. of America*, vol. VIII (new series I), pp. 329–330.

Et quant ele veut, ele met
 Le plus bas amont ou sommet,
 Et celi qui est sor la roe
 Reverse à un tor en la boe."

The ideas here expressed are to be found in Roman art and literature, so they need not detain us. The statement that Fortune elevates and debases men at will¹ is a natural development of the classical idea of mutability, represented in literature by the figure of the moving wheel, and indeed has already been made by Boethius (see above), who therefore represents the transitional stage in the evolution of the figure. The touch of realism for which we are looking is present in the last lines quoted: Fortune, by a single turn, whirls the man who is at the summit of her wheel down into the mud. Guillaume de Lorris, however, is primarily a poet whose purpose is to expound allegorically the theory of love, and not a practical and utilitarian interpreter of Latin learning, as was his continuer, Jean de Meung, and we therefore find in the former's treatment of our figure none of the realistic indications as to the varied uses of the wheel that we are to find in the second part of the poem. Guillaume de Lorris seems to have been inspired by writers in the vulgar tongue to a larger extent than was Jean de Meung,² and references to Fortune's wheel are fairly numerous in Old French, beginning with the rhymed sermon, *Grant mal fist Adam*,³ in the first third of the twelfth century. But the only poem using the rhyme *roe—boe* in this connection before Guillaume de Lorris seems to be the *Alixandre* of Lambert li Tors and Alexandre de Bernay⁴ (c. 1190):

¹ Cf. Sypherd, *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame*, London, 1907, for a discussion of Fortune's mutability as treated in mediæval literature.

² Cf. Langlois, *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose*, Paris, 1891.

³ *Reimpredigt*, hgg. von H. Suchier, Halle, 1879, strophe 123.

⁴ Hgg. von H. Micheland, *Bib. des Lit. Vereins in Stuttgart*, vol. XIII, p. 522, vv. 2-3.

applied to the heart of the victims, and moistened with poverty instead of vinegar. He need not have looked beyond the lines of Guillaume for the suggestion of Fortune's wheel, but he must have come across it also in his reading of Boethius, to Book II of whose *De consolatione philosophiæ* he owes much of what he has to say about the fickleness of Fortune and the vanity of her gifts.¹

In vv. 6068–6073 of the *Rose*, nothing is added to our information as to Jean de Meung's idea of the wheel, except the notion of the rapidity of its motion, which was a classical attribute :

“ Mès riens que Fortune feroit
Nus sages hons ne priseroit,
Ne n'el feroit lié ne dolent
Le tor de sa roe volent :
Car tuit si fait sunt trop doutable,
Por ce qu'il ne sunt pas estable.”

The wheel of Fortune is mentioned in v. 6582,

“ Toute la roe de Fortune,”

and again in vv. 6637–6643 :

“ Lesse-li sa roe torner,
Qu'el torne adès sans séjorner,
Et siet ou milieu comme avugle.
Les uns de richesses avugle,
Et d'onors et de dignetés ;
As autres done povretés,
Et quant li plaist tout en reporte.”

The blindness of Fortune is a classical attribute, but the wheel itself has in this instance assumed the functions of a *roue de fortune*, or wheel of chance. Like some modern wheels of chance, its decisions lie within the power of the one who whirls it, and humanity in its dupe.

¹ Cf. Langlois, *op. cit.*, pp. 136–138. See the citations from Boethius given above.

In vv. 6657–6910, Jean de Meung describes the island and palace of Fortune. This interesting passage is referred by Langlois¹ to the influence of Alanus de Insulis, and when we turn to his *Anticlaudianus*,² distinctio vii, cap. 8 and 9, and distinctio viii, cap. 1, we indeed find that Jean de Meung has for the most part merely paraphrased it. Yet the suggestion of several essential features of Jean's island and palace of Fortune is to be found in Boethius. For example, the former thus describes the island of Fortune (*Rose*, vv. 6657–6664):

“ Une roche est en mer séans,
Moult parfont ou mileu léans,
Qui sus la mer en haut se lance,
Contre qui la mer grouce et tance ;
Li flos la hurtent et débatent,
Et tous jors à li se combatent,
Et maintes fois tant i cotissent,
Que toute en mer l'ensevelissent ;”

and the house of Fortune perched upon the summit (vv. 6815–6828):

“ En haut, ou chief de la montaingne,
Ou pendant, non pas en la plaingne,
Menaçant tous jors trébuchance,
Preste de recevoir chéance,
Descent la maison de Fortune ;
Si n'est rage' de vent nésune
Ne torment qu'il puissent offrir,
Qu'il ne l'conviengne soffrir.
Là reçoit de toutes tempestes
Et les assaus et les molestes ;
Zéphirus, li dous vens sans per,
I vient à tart por atremper
Des durs vens les assaus orribles
A ses souffles dous et pésibles.”

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 149.

² Wright, *The Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets*, vol. II, pp. 268 f.

The essential ideas of the island assailed by the sea, and the house set upon the mountain's top and in danger of falling because of the fury of the winds, are contained in *De consolatione philosophiæ*, Book II, song iv :

“ Quisquis volet perennem
 Cautus ponere sedem
 Stabilisque nec sonori
 Sterni flatibus Euri,
 Et fluctibus minantem
 Curat spernere pontum,
 Montis cacumen alti
 Bibulas vitet arenas.
 Illud protervus Auster
 Totis viribus urget,
 Hæ pendulum solutæ
 Pondus ferre recusant.
 Fugiens periculosam
 Sortem sedis amœnæ,
 Humili domum memento
 Certus figere saxo.
 Quamvis tonet ruinis
 Miscens æquora ventus,
 Tu conditus quieti
 Felix robore valli,
 Duces serenus ævum
 Ridens ætheris iras.”

The gold and precious stones that adorn Fortune's abode (*Rose*, vv. 6835–6840),

“ Moult reluit d'une part, car gent
 I sunt li mur d'or et d'argent ;
 Si r'est toute la couverture
 De cele méisme féture,
 Ardens de pierres précieuses
 Moult cleres et moult vertueuses,”

are mentioned as the gifts of Fortune by Boethius, Book II, prose v : “ An gemmarum fulgor oculos trahit? Sed si quid est in hoc splendore præcipui, gemmarum est lux illa, non hominum : quas quidem mirari homines vehementer ad-

miror. . . . Atqui divitiæ possidentibus persæpe nocuerunt, cum pessimus quisque, eoque alieni magis avidus, quidquid usquam auri gemmarumque est, se solum, qui habeat, dignissimum putat." And in song v :

"Heu primus quis fuit ille,
Auri qui pondera tecti
Gemmasque latere volentes,
Pretiosa pericula fodit?"

The gay raiment of Fortune (*Rose*, vv. 6858-6868),

"Lors pare son cors et atorne,
Et se vest cum une roïne
De grant robe qui li traïne,
De toutes diverses olors,
De moult desguisées colors
Qui sunt ès soies ou ès laines
Selonc les herbes et les graines,
Et selonc autres choses maintes
Dont les draperies sunt taintes,
Dont toutes riches gens se vestent
Qui por honor avoir s'aprestent,"

is hinted at in Book II, song v, in which Boethius depicts the delights of the simple life of former times :

"Nec lucida vellera serum
Tyrio miscere veneno."

And in at least this case we find in Boethius Jean's real source, for Alanus says only : "Nunc meliore toga splendet,"¹ and does not refer to the dyeing. The flowers and grass which flourish on the island of Fortune when the west wind blows (*Rose*, vv. 6674-6677),

"Les floretes i fait parair,
Et cum estoiles flamboier,
Et les herbetes verdoier
Zéphirus, quant sur mer chevauche,"

¹ *Anticlaudianus*, distinctio viii, cap. 1.

are mentioned by Boethius, Book II, prose v: "An vernis floribus ipse distingueris, aut tua in æstivos fructus intumescit ubertas?" and song v: "Sommos dabat herba salubres." The course of the gentler of the two streams of Fortune's island (*Rose*, v. 6735),

"Cil fluns cort si joliement,"

recalls the *lubricus amnis* of Boethius (Book II, song v), as well as the *placida . . . unda* of Alanus (*Anticlaudianus*, distinctio viii, cap. 8). The pine tree (*Rose*, v. 6698),

"Et pin et cèdre nain séant,"

is mentioned by Boethius (Book II, song v): "Umbras altissima pinus," but not by Alanus in the passage in question (*Anticlaudianus*, distinctio viii, cap. 8). In short, Alanus de Insulis was indebted to Boethius, and Jean de Meung borrowed from both when composing this passage, though to a much greater extent from the former.

Jean de Meung's statement in this passage in regard to Fortune's wheel is contained in vv. 6881-6884 of the *Rose*:

"Puis va tant roant par la sale,
Qu'ele entre en la partie sale,
Foible, décrevée et crolant,
O toute sa roe volant."

The presence of the adverb *tant* makes necessary the conclusion that Fortune's progress is ascribed to the moving of her wheel, in other words, that the poet conceives of it as a vehicle of locomotion. Boethius's indications as to the nature of the wheel are meager enough (see above), while Alanus describes at length such a scene as we find depicted in mediæval art (*Anticlaudianus*, distinctio viii, cap. 1):

"Præcipitem movet illa rotam, motusque laborem
Nulla quies claudit, nec sistunt otia motum.
Nam cum sæpe manum dextram labor ille fatiget,

Læva manus succedit ei, fessæque sorori
 Succurrit, motumque rotæ velocius urget.
 Cujus turbo rapax, raptus celer, impetus anceps, .
 Involvens homines, a lapsus turbine nullum
 Excipit, et cunctos fati ludibria ferre
 Cogit, et in varios homines descendere casus."

Neither one of his Latin sources seems to have directed Jean de Meung in his development of Fortune's wheel in this instance, and we must ascribe his fantastic use of it to his own active imagination.

In two passages Jean de Meung refers to the impossibility of arresting Fortune's wheel (*Rose*, vv. 7145-7148 and 7359-7362):

"Quant Fortune verras venir,
 Vués-tu sa roe retenir
 Qui ne puet estre retenue
 Ne par grant gent, ne par menue?

 N'est-ce donc chose bien provable
 Que sa roe n'est pas tenable;
 Que nus ne la puet retenir,
 Tant sache à grant estat venir?"

Both are clearly based upon Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiæ*, Book II, prose i, quoted above, and Langlois refers the first of the two passages to this source.¹ I would add the second, which is included in a passage whose thought Jean de Meung owes to Book II, prose ii.

In vv. 7591-7598 of the *Rose*, for which Langlois offers no parallel, Jean de Meung emphasises the unexpectedness of Fortune's gifts:

"De Fortune la sémilleuse
 Et de sa roe périlleuse
 Tous les tors conter ne porroie.
 C'est li gieu de boute-en-corroie,

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

Que Fortune set si partir,
 Que nus devant au départir
 Ne puet avoir science aperte
 S'il i prendra gaaing ou perte."

Boethius hints at the unexpectedness of Fortune's changes in Book II, prose i: "Intellego multiformes illius prodigii fucos, et eo usque cum his, quos eludere nititur, blandissimam familiaritatem, dum intolerabili dolore confundat, quos insperata reliquerit." I would suggest this passage as a sufficient source for Jean's lines.

In vv. 8789-8792 Jean de Meung puts into the mouth of Amis the words :

"Tuit cil amis si s'enfoïrent,
 Et me firent trestuit la moe
 Quant il me virent sous la roe
 De Fortune envers abatu."

They suggest the picture presented in the original passage in Guillaume de Lorris, and Jean de Meung's adaptation of it. In his last reference to Fortune's wheel (vv. 10219-10221) Jean does not mention the goddess :

"Lors est tornée la roële,
 Que cil qui soloit servir cele,
 Commande que cele le serve."

In the remaining twelve thousand five hundred lines of the *Roman de la Rose*, the wheel of Fortune is not referred to.

STANLEY LEMAN GALPIN.

XIV.—CHAUCER'S *MEDEA* AND THE DATE OF THE *LEGEND OF GOOD WOMEN*.

I.

In the Man of Law's introduction, we are told that anybody who wishes to refer to Chaucer's "*Seintes Legende of Cupyde*" may see there, among other things,

"The crueltee of thee, queen Medea,
Thy litel children hanging by the hals."¹

Now the *Legend of Good Women* contains nothing that corresponds precisely with these lines. The discrepancy is not startling, but it is sufficient to stimulate conjecture. Professor Lounsbury, in 1892, suggested as a possibility that "when Chaucer wrote the prologue to the Man of Law's Tale he had not written the account of Medea which has come down to us [in the *Legend*]; and that when it was written it came to be something different from what he had purposed to make it originally."² In a recent article in these *Publications*³ Professor Root has attempted to bring evidence in support of Mr. Lounsbury's suggestion.

Mr. Root's argument, as I understand it, is this:—Until Chaucer wrote the *Legend of Hypsipyle and Medea* he was acquainted with Medea's story from the *Roman de la Rose* alone.⁴ When he wrote the Man of Law's introduction (in 1390 or later) his knowledge of Medea was likewise confined to what he had learned from Jean de Meun. But the *Legend of Hypsipyle and Medea* shows the use of two

¹ *Canterbury Tales*, B, 60 ff.

² *Studies in Chaucer*, I, 418–19.

³ XXIV, 124 ff.

⁴ Ed. Michel, II, 83–84; II, 118.

other sources of information,—Guido delle Colonne and Ovid's *Heroides*. Therefore this legend is later than 1390.

Now it is well known that Chaucer mentions the tale of Medea and Jason in the *Book of the Duchess* as a part of "the storie of Troye":—

For hoolly al the storie of Troye
Was in the glasing ywrought thus,
Of Ector and King Priamus,
Of Achilles and Lamedon,
Of Medea and of Iason,
Of Paris, Eleyne, and Lavyne¹ (vv. 326–31).

The natural inference is that, by 1370, Chaucer had read Benoit's long account of Jason and Medea in the *Roman de Troie*.² But Mr. Root thinks differently. "Here," he says, "we find Chaucer associating the story of Medea with those of Hector and Priam, Achilles and Lamedon, as part of the 'storie of Troye.' There indeed in the romance of Troy the story of Jason and Medea may be found, told at length as an introductory episode to the first destruction of Troy, in Benoît de Ste. More and in Guido delle Colonne. That Chaucer knew where the story was to be found, does not, of course, prove that he had read it. He alludes often enough to books that he has never read, as do we moderns also. There is nothing in the present allusion . . . to suggest that Chaucer had read either Benoit's version of the tale or Guido's till he came to write his *Legend*."

¹ Benoit says that Æneas went to Lombardy (vv. 28127–30) and Guido that he "peruenit italiam et in tusciam se recepit" (ed. 1489, sig. n. 4, 2 verso). Neither of them speaks of Lavinia. The *Roman de la Rose* (ed. Michel, II, 321) mentions her along with Helen: "N'onques Helaine ne Lavine Ne furent de color si fine."

² Or in Guido. For the sake of simplicity, I confine the argument to Benoit. In my opinion Benoit, rather than Guido, was in Chaucer's mind in this passage of the *Book of the Duchess*, as well as in other passages of that poem (to be quoted presently). But, if Guido be substituted for Benoit, the considerations which I shall urge will be equally cogent.

Mr. Root's admission that Chaucer knew that the story of Medea was to be found in Benoit somewhat weakens his case. How did Chaucer know, one is inclined to ask, if he had not read the passage?¹ But the point need not be pressed. The question whether Chaucer, when he wrote vv. 326–31 of the *Book of the Duchess*, was familiar with vv. 1199–2026 of Benoit's romance (which contain the story of Medea) is really part of the larger question whether he had read the *Roman de Troie* at all,—for if so, he would not have been likely to skip the first two thousand lines. And this larger question may unhesitatingly be answered in the affirmative.

The evidence is not confined to vv. 326–31 of the *Duchess*. That poem contains three other pertinent passages, which Mr. Root ignores, doubtless because he does not regard them as significant. They are as follows:—

- (1) And therto al so hardy be
As was Ector, so have I ioye,
That Achilles slow at Troye—
And therfor was he slayn also
In a temple, for bothe two
Were slayn, he and Antilogus,²
And so seyth Dares Frigius,
For love of Polixene (vv. 1064–71).
- (2) Or Anthenor, so have I ioye,
The traytour that betrayed Troye (vv. 1119–20).
- (3) Cassandra, that so
Bewayled the destruccioun
Of Troye and of Ilioun,
Had never swich sorwe as I tho (vv. 1246–49).

¹ It will not help matters to refer to Benoit's initial summary, vv. 151 ff. If Chaucer had read these lines, he would probably have read vv. 1199 ff. as well. For convenience, I use Joly's numbering of the lines in Benoit.

² The mss. have *Antilegius*, or the like. The emendation, which improves the metre, is adopted by Skeat in his *Index of Proper Names* (Oxford Chaucer, vi, 360).

None of these passages can have come from the *Roman de la Rose*. The obvious inference is that Chaucer derived his information from Benoit.

(1) In vv. 21799–22256,¹ Benoit tells of the ambushade in the temple of Apollo and of the slaughter of Achilles and Antilogus [*i. e.* Antilochus], who had visited the temple in order that Achilles might marry Polyxena. The plot was laid, as Benoit informs us, in revenge for the death of Hector and Troilus, and Dares is cited (as in Chaucer):—

S'ai en l'escrit Daires² trové
Que il [*sc.* Paris] les a toz detrenchiez (vv. 22248–9).³

(2) The treason of Antenor may be found in Benoit, vv. 24625 ff.⁴ It is described at great length, and comes in, of course, immediately before and during the account of the fall of the city. Antenor is called “li vielz Judas” in v. 25738, only about three hundred lines before the lamentation of Cassandra, and the “traitors” are spoken of in v. 25983, immediately before the lamentation.

(3) The lamentation of Cassandra is vividly described by Benoit⁵ in vv. 26009–18:—

L'ovre mortal et la destine
Conoît Cassandre la devine,
Veit ço que tant a prononcié
Et promis et prophetizié.
S'ele a dolours riens nel demant.
Tote sole s'en vait fuiant,

¹See also Guido, ed. 1489, sig. l 3, verso—l 4, recto.

²Benoit uses the form *Dares* (as well as *Daires*) elsewhere. We have no critical text of this part of the *Roman de Troie*. So far as I know, he does not employ the full form *Dares Phrygius* anywhere, but the name was well-known.

³Guido does not cite *Dares* here.

⁴See also Guido, sig. m ff. In a passage of the *Troilus* (I, 197–210) which is not from the *Filostrato* Chaucer recurs to the treason of Antenor.

⁵See also Guido, sig. m 4, 2 verso, col. 2.

Que riens ne la conuist ne treve,
 Enz el riche temple Minerve.
 Là se detort, là se degete,
 O doleros plainz se regrete.

There is no mention of Cassandra's lamentation in either Dictys or Dares.¹

The three passages which we have just examined prove that Chaucer was familiar with the latter part of the *Roman de Troie* when he wrote the *Book of the Duchess*. Is it credible that he had not read the beginning of the romance, and that nevertheless he mentioned Jason and Medea in v. 330 as characters in "the storie of Troye"? We should remember that Medea is not, in the natural order of things, a personage in the history of the Trojan War. Chaucer mentions her in that capacity because her story is included by Benoit. The narrative in the *Roman de Troie* begins with the Argonautic Expedition (v. 703). It was the treatment of the Argonauts by Laomedon that brought their expedition into the Trojan story. Benoit's account of Laomedon is in vv. 989-1119 and vv. 2063-2810, and the episode of Medea falls between these two passages (vv. 1199-2026). The *Roman de la Rose* does not make Medea a character in the tale of Troy, and nowhere speaks of Laomedon. Yet Chaucer mentions him, in the same Trojan passage of the *Duchess* in which he mentions Jason and Medea. The conclusion is unavoidable. When Chaucer wrote the *Book*

¹ Guido has merely "Cassandra vero quasi demens affecta sola fugit et minerue templum intrauit vbi suorum omnium excidium grauter lamentatur." Virgil, *Aen.*, II, 403-6, would not have given Chaucer the hint. There is another passage in Benoit (vv. 10355-84 Joly) which may have been in Chaucer's mind. It mentions both "Ylion" ("Abatuz sera Ylion," v. 10366) and "Troie" ("Ha riche Troie, a quel eissil Sereiz dessi qu'a poi livrée," vv. 10380-1), as Chaucer does. Cf. Guido, sig. h 3, verso (when, however, Ilion is not separately mentioned). This lament, like the other, is in neither Dictys nor Dares.

of the *Duchess* he had read not only the latter part of the *Roman de Troie* but the first two thousand lines as well.¹ He was therefore familiar with Benoit's account of Medea. This is surely "a most pregnant and unforced position" in itself, and there is not a particle of evidence against it.²

Let us next consider the *Troilus*. Between the date of the *Book of the Duchess* and the date of the *Troilus* Chaucer had read much, but he had not forgotten Benoit. And he reverted to him when he was composing his great psychological novel. His borrowings from the *Roman de Troie* in the *Troilus* are due not to mere vague recollection, but to a deliberate restudy of at least a part of the poem.³ Of course we cannot prove that he actually read the Medea episode on this occasion, for Medea is not mentioned in the *Troilus*. But it would be singular if he had skipped this particular passage every time.

We must pass on to the *Heroides*. When Chaucer first read this work is uncertain, but it was doubtless early in his career. He demonstrably knew it when he wrote the *Troilus*, for he speaks of CEnone's letter to Paris (*Heroides*, v) and paraphrases a passage.⁴ There is nothing of this in the *Filostrato*. It would be unreasonable to maintain (with-

¹ It will hardly be contended that Chaucer read Benoit's summary account of Jason, Hercules, Medea, and Laomedon in vv. 151-63 and did not go on to vv. 989 ff.

² The fact that Chaucer was familiar with what Jean de Meun says of Medea is of course no reason for believing that he had not also read Benoit's account of her. There is nothing inconsistent in the two narratives. Benoit simply does not tell that part of Medea's story which concerns the murder of her children, and Jean de Meun does tell it (II, 84). There is nothing in Benoit that would discredit Jean de Meun.

³ See Dr. Karl Young's investigation, *The Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Criseyde* (Chaucer Society, 1908), where full references to previous studies may be found.

⁴ *Troilus*, I, 652-65; see *Her.*, v, 139-46, and (for Apollo and Admetus) cf. *Ars. Am.*, II, 239-42.

out very positive evidence) that Chaucer had read the fifth epistle only, failing to take up the sixth (*Hypsipyle to Jason*)¹ and the twelfth (*Medea to Jason*).² *Hypsipyle to*

¹ See p. 351, below.

² "For-why men rede That love is thing ay ful of bisy drede" (*Troilus*, iv, 1644-5) is Ovid's "Res est solliciti plena timoris amor," as Francis Junius noted, centuries ago, in his copy of the Folio of 1598 (Bodleian Library, MS. Jun. 9). See *Heroides*, I, 12 (*Penelope to Ulysses*). The *Filostrato* has no such line, but it was a stock quotation. It is found, for example, in the Ovidian *flosculi* given by Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum Historiale*, vi, 107 (Venice, 1494, fol. 67 recto).

Further evidence of Chaucer's reading in Ovid is seen in the use which he makes of the *Remedium Amoris* (cf. *B. Duch.*, v. 568) in the *Troilus*. (1) "For who-so list have helping of his leche, To him behoveth first unwrye his wounde," I, 857-8; cf. *R. A.*, 125-6: "Adgrediar melius tum, cum sua vulnera tangi Iam sinet;" (2) "For thilke ground that bereth the wedes wikke, Bereth eak thise holsom herbes, as ful ofte Next the foule nettle, rough and thikke, The rose wexeth, swote and smothe and softe," I, 946 ff.; cf. *R. A.*, 45-46: "Terra salutare herbas eademque nocentes Nutrit, et urticae proxima saepe rosa est." (3) In *R. A.*, 135 ff., Ovid prescribes occupation as a remedy for love (see especially vv. 139, 144, 149-50, 205-6); next comes absence (214 ff.); somewhat later the patient is directed to seek a new love in order to recover from the old (451 ff.), and this advice is fortified by the example of Agamemnon, who got rid of his passion for Chryseis by transferring his affections to the captive ("si prima sinat syllaba, nomen idem," 476) whom he took away from Achilles—"et posita est cura cura repulsa nova" (484). Compare *Troilus*, iv, 421 ff. :—

For al so seur as day cometh after night,
The newe love, labour, or other wo,
Or elles selde seinge of a wight,
Don old affeccions alle over-go.

None of the passages quoted under 1, 2, and 3, is in the *Filostrato*. Nos. 1 and 2 are in the *flosculi* in Vincent of Beauvais (*Speculum Historiale*, vi, 144, fol. 68 recto-verso, ed. Venice, 1494), but the parallel in No. 3 is pretty significant, especially in view of the interest that Chaucer would of course take in Ovid's testimony about Chryseis. (4) "And eek, as writ Zanzis, that was ful wys, 'The newe love out chaceth ofte the olde,'" iv, 414-15, is Ovid's "Successore novo vincitur omnis amor" (*R. A.*, 462, quoted by Skeat), which comes just five lines before the Chryseis passage; but here Boccaccio intervenes: "E come io udii già sovente dire, Il nuovo

Jason, we should remember, contains a great deal about Medea, including a plain reference to the murder of the children.

In the *House of Fame*¹ Chaucer's acquaintance with the *Heroides* is abundantly evident.² The well known passage (vv. 378 ff.) in which he expressly refers to the "Epistle of Ovyde" from Dido to Æneas (*Heroides*, VII), appending further examples of masculine perfidy (Demphoon to Phyllis; Achilles to Briseis; Paris to CEnone; Jason to Hypsipyle; "left Iason to Medea"; Hercules to Dejanira; Theseus to Ariadne) is conclusive. For, however much this passage may have been influenced by the *Roman de la Rose*,³ it contains several things that Chaucer did not learn from that poem and that he did learn from the *Heroides*. These are, besides the fact that Ovid wrote an Epistle of Dido to Æneas, the following:—the knowledge that Demophoon was "duk of Athenes" and that Phyllis was daughter to the Thracian king;⁴ Demophoon's forswearing himself (which is strongly emphasized by Ovid);⁵ the infidelity of Achilles

amor sempre caccia l'antico" (*Filostr.*, IV, 49). The lines stand also among Vincent's *flosculi* (VI, 115, fol. 68 verso).

Pandar's advice to Troilus about the love-letter (II, 1023 ff.) is partly from *Ars Am.*, I, 457-68. Possibly, as Skeat suggests, *Troil.*, II, 1027, is reminiscent of *Her.*, III, 3 (an epistle which Chaucer certainly knew when he wrote the *Troilus*).

In the *Parliament of Fowls*, vv. 253-6, Chaucer shows his acquaintance with *Fasti*, I, 415-38 (Priapus).

¹I have believed (and taught) for years that the *House of Fame* is earlier than the *Troilus*. But the relative age of the two poems makes no difference to the present argument, since both are older than the *Man of Law's* introduction.

²See Skeat's notes (*Oxford Chaucer*, III, 251-2), where interesting marginalia from MSS. may be found.

³See Root, pp. 130-31.

⁴*Heroides*, II, 13, 78, 81-83, 89, 108, 111-12.

⁵*Her.*, II, 23-24, 31-44, 53.

to Briseis,¹ of Jason to Hypsipyle,² of Hercules to Dejanira,³ and of Theseus to Ariadne.⁴ It is clear that, when he wrote the *House of Fame*, Chaucer had read the second, third, sixth, seventh, ninth, and tenth epistles of the *Heroides*. Had he sedulously refrained from reading the twelfth epistle (*Medea to Jason*), although he had long felt an interest in Medea's story, and although the sixth epistle (*Hypsipyle to Jason*), which he *did* read, contains nearly as much about Medea as about Hypsipyle? Almost anything is possible in this world, but we are bound in reason to follow probabilities.

And now we must consider Chaucer's knowledge of the *Metamorphoses*, his "owen book," as the Eagle calls it in the *House of Fame* (v. 712). "There is nothing," writes Mr. Root,⁵ "to show that he was in any way acquainted with Ovid's version [of the Medea story] in *Metamorphoses*, 7, or that he even knew of its existence." Let us see.

Without professing to get together all the passages⁶ in which, before he wrote the Man of Law's introduction, *ca.* 1390, Chaucer disclosed his intimate familiarity with Ovid's masterpiece, one may assert, without fear of contradiction, that these involve a knowledge on his part of books i,⁷ ii,⁸ iv,⁹ v,¹⁰ vi,¹¹ viii,¹² x,¹³ xi,¹⁴ xii,¹⁵ xiii,¹⁶ and probably also ix,¹⁷

¹ *Her.*, III.² *Her.*, VI.³ *Her.*, IX.⁴ *Her.*, X.⁵ P. 134, note 1.⁶ Here, as elsewhere, I have of course made the freest use of Professor Skeat's notes and other apparatus.⁷ *Troil.*, IV, 1543-5 ("Satyry and Fauny," "halve-goddes"); *Met.*, I, 192-3; cf. Boccaccio, *Gen. Deor.*, VIII, 13 (ed. 1511, fol. 64 verso). Not in *Filistr.* or *R. R.*⁸ *Troil.*, III, 729-30 (Herse, Aglaurus); *Met.*, II, 708 ff.—*Troil.*, III, 1703-4 (Pyrois, etc.); *Met.*, II, 153-4.—*Troil.*, V, 663-5 (Phaethon); *Met.*, II, 1 ff. (None of them in *Filistr.* or *R. R.*)⁹ *Troil.*, IV, 1538-40 (Athamas); *Met.*, IV, 447 ff. Not in *Filistr.* or *R. R.* For Chaucer's form *Athamante* see the acc. *Athamanta*, *Met.*, IV, 466, 470.—*Troil.*, V, 211-12 (Ixion); *Met.*, IV, 460. The information about Ixion might have been derived from *R. R.*, II, 272; but note that *Met.*, IV, 460, stands in the story of the madness of Athamas, which is not in *R. R.*

xiv,¹ and xv.² *What likelihood is there that he had failed to read book vii?*

¹⁰ *Troil.*, v, 319 (Ascalaphus); *Met.*, v, 534 ff. Not in *Filostr.* or *R. R.* The Man of Law mentions the *Metamorphoses* in his introduction (B, 92-93), and speaks of the Pierides or false Muses (see *Met.*, v, 294-678).

¹¹ *H. F.*, vv. 1229-32 (Marsyas); *Met.*, vi, 382-400. Dante, *Par.*, i, 20-21, is insufficient. A passage which Michel gives from some fifteenth-century MSS. of *R. R.* is full enough (i, 360), but does not afford the name *Marcia*; it has *Marse* (Dante, *Par.*, i, 20-21, *Marsia*; *Met.*, vi, 400, "*Marsya nomen habet*").—*Troil.*, ii, 64-70 (Progne and Tereus); *Met.*, vi, 412 ff. Not in *Filostr.* or *R. R.*—*Troil.*, i, 699-700 (Niobe); *Met.*, vi, 312. Not in *Filostr.* or *R. R.*

¹² *H. F.*, vv. 919-24 (Icarus); *Met.*, viii, 183 ff. *R. R.*, i, 173-4, and Dante, *Inf.*, xvii, 109-11 (cf. *Par.*, viii, 125-6) are insufficient.—*Troil.*, v, 1457 ff. (Atalanta); *Met.*, viii, 271 ff. Not in *Filostr.* or *R. R.*

¹³ *Troil.*, iv, 1138-9 (Myrrha); *Met.*, x, 298 ff. (especially 500-2). Not in *Filostr.*; *R. R.*, ii, 332-3, is insufficient.—*H. F.*, vv. 589-92 (Ganymede); *Met.*, x, 155-161.

¹⁴ *B. Duch.*, vv. 62 ff. (Ceyx and Alcyone); *Met.*, xi, 410 ff.—*H. F.*, vv. 69-76 (Morpheus); *Met.*, xi, 592-614.—*Troil.*, iv, 789-91 (permanent reunion of Orpheus and Eurydice); *Met.*, xi, 61-66. (Not in *Filostr.* or *R. R.*) Chaucer's "feld of pitee" is Ovid's "*arva piorum*," and his "Elysos" may have come from a marginal "*campos Elysios*."—Chaucer's mention of Midas's ears in *Troil.*, iii, 1388-9 (not from *Filostr.*), might of course come from *R. R.*, i, 360, if the latter passage were not (as it seems to be) an interpolation. But his characterization of Midas as "ful of coveityse" is another matter, for *R. R.* does not speak of the Golden Touch. Chaucer had read Ovid's account (*Met.*, xi, 100 ff.); for covetousness see *Met.*, xi, 118-19, 132, 136, 141.—*Troil.*, iv, 120-6 (Laomedon), may be compared, tentatively, with *Met.*, xi, 199-208, and *Her.*, v, 139; but things do not exactly fit (see also Bode, *Scriptores Rerum Mythicarum*, 1834, i, 43-44 (Mythogr. i, caps. 136, 137), 138 (Mythogr. ii, cap. 193), 174 (Mythogr. iii, cap. 5, § 7). Benoit (vv. 25814-19) speaks of the walls of Troy as built by Neptune and dedicated by Apollo (cf. Gower, *C. A.*, i, 1152-5).

¹⁵ Ovid's House of Fame, *Met.*, xii, 39 ff.

¹⁶ *Troil.*, iv, 1548-53 (Simois, in an oath); *Met.*, xiii, 324-7. Not in *Filostr.* or *R. R.*

¹⁷ *Parl. F.*, v, 289 (Byblis); *Met.*, ix, 454 ff. Not in *R. R.* Cf. Boccaccio, *Amorosa Visione*, xxv, 14 ff. (*Biblide*).

¹ *Troil.*, iv, 25 (Quirinus); *Met.*, xiv, 772 ff. (especially 828 ff.). Cf. next note. See also *H. F.*, v, 589.

² *Troil.*, iv, 25 ("Thou cruel Mars eek, fader to Quirine"); *Met.*, xv,

Finally we come to a curious omission on Mr. Root's part. He dates the *Man of Law's* introduction 1390 or later because of its reprobation of two "cursed stories" ("Canacee" and "Tyro Apollonius"), which is generally held to glance at the *Confessio Amantis*, first published in that year. Chaucer, then, was familiar with the *Confessio* when he wrote this introduction. Yet, in Mr. Root's opinion, at this very time he knew the Medea story from the *Roman de la Rose* only. How about Gower's tale of Medea, which takes up nearly a thousand verses¹ in the fifth book of the *Confessio*? Was *that* unfamiliar to Chaucer? Had he read the story of Canace in the third book,² and the story of Apollonius in the eighth book,³ and overlooked the story of Medea in the fifth? The question answers itself.

It is certain, then, that Chaucer, when he wrote the *Man of Law's* introduction, was on intimate terms with Benoit's *Roman de Troie*, with the *Heroides*, with the *Metamorphoses*, and with the *Confessio Amantis*. Each of these four works includes the tale of Medea, in whom, as we know, Chaucer was interested as early as 1370. We are compelled to infer that, when he wrote the introduction, his knowledge of the Medea story was not, as Mr. Root thinks, limited to the confines of the *Roman de la Rose*. On the contrary, we may feel sure that he had read it in some of these other works, and probably in all of them. That he should have overlooked or ignored it in *every one of the four* is quite incredible.

Now there was nothing in Benoit or in the *Heroides* or the *Confessio* to inform Chaucer just how Medea murdered her children. On that point he had, so far as we can discover,

863 ("invicti genitor Gradive Quirini"). Not in *Filistr.* or *R. R.* Cf. preceding note.

¹ Vv. 3247-4222.

² Vv. 143-336.

³ Vv. 271-2008.

only the *Roman de la Rose* and the *Metamorphoses* to guide him. The *Roman* declares that she strangled them (*estragla*),¹ the *Metamorphoses* that she used a sword ("Sanguine natorum perfunditur impius ensis").² In the Man of Law's introduction, Chaucer preferred the former alternative, as he had a perfect right to do. What he says in this place is in no way inconsistent with Benoit or the *Heroides* or the *Confessio*.³ It is inconsistent with the *Metamorphoses*, but that fact has no bearing on the question whether or not Chaucer knew Benoit and the *Heroides* and the *Confessio*. Indeed, it does not even indicate (in the face of the very strong probability to the contrary) that he had not read the seventh book of the *Metamorphoses*, any more than his having preferred a sword (if he had done so) would have indicated that he was ignorant of Jean de Meun's account of Medea in the *Roman de la Rose*. For our present purpose, however, we might (if we saw fit) accept Mr. Root's opinion that Chaucer was ignorant of the account in the *Metamorphoses*. If, when he wrote the Man of Law's introduction, he knew the story of Medea in Benoit (or Guido) and in the *Heroides*,—to say nothing of the *Confessio*,—Mr. Root's argument falls to the ground.

¹ II, 84; see Root, p. 127.

² VII, 396.

³ Benoit does not mention the murder. He says that the gods were angry with Jason for his faithlessness and avenged Medea "trop asprement" (vv. 2024-6). In the *Heroides* the death of the children is contemplated, but particulars are not given (VI, 159-60; cf., XII, 211-12), although there is a suggestion of actual bloodshed ("caede 'cruenta suo," VI, 162, words which would be amply justified by the slaughter of Absyrtus, *Her.*, VI, 129-30, even if Medea had not killed her children). Gower says that Medea "slew" Jason's two sons "before his eye" (*C. A.*, v, 4210-6). Boccaccio (*Amorosa Visione*, xxi-ii) has much to say of Jason and his three wives (Hypsipyle, Medea, and Creusa), but does not mention the murder. In his *De Genealogia Deorum*, however, he speaks of the children as killed with a sword—"gladio laniari" (XIII, 26, ed. 1511, fol. 98 recto).

The theory, therefore, that Chaucer wrote the *Legend of Hypsipyle and Medea* after he had written the Man of Law's introduction, derives no support from Mr. Root's paper. It remains just what it was when Mr. Lounsbury left it in 1892,—that is, pure theory,¹ without anything to uphold it except the discrepancy between the *Legend of Good Women* and the Medean utterance of the Man of Law.

Let us scrutinize this discrepancy a little more closely. Is it really a serious matter? By no means. The Man of Law remarks that if we turn to Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women* we shall see "the cruelty of Queen Medea,—her little children hanging by the neek." We consult the *Legend of Hypsipyle and Medea* (which is one continuous narrative) and find that, although Chaucer does not expressly say that Medea hanged her children, he does make Hypsipyle forecast their murder in outspoken terms. In Ovid, Hypsipyle voices the wish that Medea may be as ferocious (*acerba*) toward her children and her husband as she has already shown herself toward her brother and her wretched father.² In Chaucer's *Legend*, Hypsipyle prays that Medea may destroy both her children.³ This sharpening of Ovid's words is rather significant. At all events, the discrepancy between the Man of Law's introduction and the *Legend of Good Women* is very trifling. It consists in little more than the particularizing of a generality. Assuredly it affords no basis for any revolutionary theories of Chaucerian chronology.⁴

¹ Mr. Lounsbury himself said very frankly that the theory "has nothing in its favor that can strictly be called evidence" (*Studies in Chaucer*, I, 419).

² "Quam fratri germana fuit miseroque parenti

Filia, tam natis, tam sit acerba viro" (*Her.*, VI, 159–60).

³ "And that she moste bothe her children spille"

(*Legend of Good Women*, v. 1574).

⁴ The fact that Chaucer refers to Medea's killing her children in the Hypsipyle part of the story rather than in the Medea part is of no conse-

And Mr. Root's theories are, indeed, little short of revolutionary. For, having dated the *Legend of Hypsipyle and Medea* after 1390, he infers that the five legends that follow it (*Lucretia, Ariadne, Philomela, Phyllis, and Hypermnestra*) are later still. He holds, therefore, that Chaucer continued to work at intervals on the *Legend of Good Women* after the Canterbury pilgrimage was well on its way. However, since the supposed evidence for Mr. Root's date of *Hypsipyle and Medea* turns out to be illusory, all these inferences become mere unsupported conjecture.

quence, since he makes the story of these two heroines one continuous narrative, under a single title (*Legenda Ysiphile et Medee, Martyrum*). The Man of Law does not say that we shall find a separate story of Medea, or anything in particular in such a story. We have a right to use anything that we can find in the double story, or, indeed, in the *Legend of Good Women* anywhere, in justifying his reference.

We may note, by the way, that Chaucer's account of the Apollonius story contains a hideous detail not to be found in Gower ("Whan he, hir threw upon the pavement," B, 85). Yet even Mr. Root, who found this discrepancy significant in 1906 (*Poetry of Chaucer*, p. 184, note 2), now believes that it affords no ground for thinking that Chaucer is not glancing at Gower in the passage (p. 138, note 1). One may be allowed to regard the slight discrepancy between the Man of Law's introduction and the *Legend of Hypsipyle and Medea* as equally non-significant.

Again, should we be troubled by a slight discrepancy in Medea's case, when, in the same introduction, there is a more striking discrepancy which no one regards as of any consequence? I refer, of course, to the Man of Law's declaring that Chaucer "no word he wryteth" of "thilke wikke ensample of Canacee," despite the fact that, in the *ballade* (both versions), this unfortunate lady is quite particularly celebrated as one of the heroines who, though famous for her truth, must make no "boost ne soun" of it in comparison with Alcestis (or "my lady"). The line in question—"and Canace, espyed by thy chere"—is a manifest allusion to the eleventh epistle of the *Heroides* (27-36). When Chaucer wrote the *ballade*, he probably meant to include Canace among his Good Women, but, by the time he wrote the Man of Law's introduction, he seems to have changed his mind and did not hesitate to laugh at Gower for telling her story. However that may be, the discrepancy is more serious than that in the case of Medea. Yet nobody holds that the *ballade* was not written until 1390.

II.

The obvious and received opinion with regard to the *Legend of Good Women* is that Chaucer dropped it to begin the *Canterbury Tales*, and that he never again took it in hand, except to revise the *Prologue*. This opinion is *prima facie* impregnable. It cannot be shaken without positive evidence, and, as we have seen, there is no such evidence forthcoming.

Still, though the accepted view needs no defence, it may be worth while to consider, for a moment, how admirably it accounts for all the phenomena,—and, in particular, how consonant it is with the statements in the Man of Law's introduction. Such a consideration requires some little study of the *Confessio Amantis*.

When the *Confessio Amantis* was published, in 1390, Chaucer's mind must have been forcibly recalled to his own *Legend of Good Women*, which he had laid aside to take up the *Canterbury Tales*, but which he doubtless hoped to finish some day. In Gower's concluding book (the eighth) Chaucer found a scene that was designedly reminiscent of the *Prologue* to the *Legend*.¹ It included a vision of a Parliament of Love.² It contained a Flower and Leaf passage.³ It adverted to the story of Cressida, with her double love for Troilus and Diomedes.⁴ It brought in the author, in his proper person, in conference with the Goddess of Love, and represented him as employing a mediator⁵ and as getting

¹ On the resemblances between the two works see Bech, *Anglia*, v, 365 ff. ; Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, III, xl-xlii ; Macaulay, *Gower*, III, 545-6 ; Kittredge, *Modern Philology*, I, 2, and VI, 438-9 ; Tatlock, *Development and Chronology*, pp. 128-30.

² Vv. 2450 ff., 2805.

⁴ Vv. 2531-5.

³ Vv. 2462-8.

⁵ Vv. 2171 ff., 2203 ff.

pardon for past offences.¹ It contained a message from the goddess to Chaucer, bidding him write a poem.² It complimented Chaucer on the lyrics which he had composed in Love's service,³ lyrics which had been pointedly adduced in evidence in Chaucer's *Prologue*⁴ and of which the *ballade* therein recited might serve as a specimen. Further, Gower names, as present at the Parliament, eleven out of the eighteen⁵ ladies named in Chaucer's *ballade*.⁶ And as Chaucer, in his *Prologue*, had described Alcestis as the Queen of Love, whom all commended, and the crowning glory of wifely devotion, so Gower, in his Parliament, designated four wives who were honored above all others by Love's retainers,⁷ and Alcestis⁸ was one of the four.

Then, too,—and this must have struck him particularly,—Chaucer found that Gower had brought together, in a passage of less than fifty lines,⁹ the names of eleven heroines who had been unfortunate in love, and that this list included seven out of the ten whose legends he himself¹⁰ had written

¹ Vv. 2891-7.

² Vv. 2941 ff.

³ Vv. 2941-9.

⁴ A, vv. 410-11; B, vv. 422-3. The lines are the same in A and B.

⁵ In version B. In A, Alcestis is mentioned, making nineteen. If she is counted, the figures are twelve out of nineteen.

⁶ As follows, in the order of the *ballade*:—Penelope (vv. 2621 ff.), Isolde (v. 2501), Helen (v. 2529), Lucretia (vv. 2632 ff.), Polyxena (vv. 2590 ff.), Cleopatra (vv. 2572 ff.), Thisbe (vv. 2578 ff.), Dido (vv. 2552-3), Phyllis (vv. 2554-5), Canace (vv. 2587-9), Ariadne (vv. 2556-8). The omissions are Esther, "Marcia Catoun," Lavinia, Hero, Laodamia, Hypsipyle, and Hypermnestra.

⁷ Vv. 2605-60.

⁸ Vv. 2640-6.

⁹ Vv. 2550-96.

¹⁰ Dido (Chaucer, *Legend*, iii), Phyllis (viii), Ariadne (vi), Medea (iv), Cleopatra (i), Thisbe (ii), Philomela (vii). I count Philomela and Progne as *one*, since the story of one involves the other. The only omissions are Hypsipyle (iv), Hypermnestra (ix), and Lucretia (v),—and Lucretia is omitted in order that she may be specially mentioned a few lines later (vv. 2632-9). Cf. Tatlock, pp. 128-9.

and two others whom he had mentioned in his *ballade*.¹ And, as if to make the list more signally allusive, Gower had brought in Cleopatra's pit of serpents,² which was a peculiar feature of Chaucer's account of her death. And further, this list came almost immediately before Gower's commendation of the Four Chief Ladies³—one of whom, as we have noted, was Alcestis.

But this was not all. Gower had told, in one or another part of his *Confessio*, almost every story which Chaucer had embodied in his *Legend* up to this time. There were Cleopatra⁴ and Thisbe⁵ and Dido⁶ and Medea⁷ and Lucretia⁸ and Ariadne⁹ and Philomela¹⁰ and Phyllis,¹¹—every single one, that is to say, except Hypsipyle and Hypermnestra. There was also the tale of Alcestis,¹² which Chaucer had summarized,¹³ and which he intended to relate in full as the final chapter in his series.

No wonder that, when the *Confessio Amantis* appeared, Chaucer's thoughts went back to his *Legend*, and that he registered a new vow to complete it some day. We need not imagine that he was irritated or offended by Gower's compliments, or by the fact that the *Confessio* covered a good deal of the ground which the *Legend* occupied. But beyond question the appearance of the *Confessio* in 1390 made it only natural for Chaucer to refer rather particularly, in the Man of Law's introduction, to his "Seyntes

¹Canace and Polyxena. Penelope (also in Chaucer's *ballade*) is reserved (like Lucretia) for particular mention a few lines later (vv. 2621-31).

²Vv. 2573-5.

³Vv. 2605 ff. The interval is only eight lines.

⁴Briefly, as already noted, but with reproduction of the peculiar manner of her death (viii, 2571-7).

⁵iii, 1331 ff.

⁶iv, 77 ff.

⁷v, 3247 ff.

⁸vii, 4754 ff.

⁹v, 5231 ff.

¹⁰v, 5551 ff.

¹¹iv, 731 ff.

¹²vii, 1917 ff.

¹³B, vv. 510 ff. (=A, vv. 498 ff.).

Legende of Cupyde" and its contents. Accordingly, the Man of Law names eight out of the ten heroines whose stories Chaucer had already composed,¹ and also, of course, Alcestis and Alcyone—the one particularly celebrated in the *Prologue* and the other in the *Book of the Duchess*. As to Alcyone, Gower had made her one of his Four Chief Ladies² and had written at large about her in his fourth book.³ It seems likely, on the whole, that the Man of Law's introduction dates from 1390, or very soon after, while the publication of the *Confessio* was a recent occurrence. We may note that all the considerations we have before us are in full accord with the humorous reprobation of the tale of Canace (whose story Gower had told in his third book and to whom he had reverted in the eighth) and of the tale of Apollonius (to which a large part of book viii is devoted). And they also fit the opinion that Chaucer actually got to work on a revision of the *Prologue* to the *Legend* ca. 1394,⁴ though they in no way depend on that opinion.

The Man of Law's citations, it will be observed, are, so far as we have examined them, amply justified by what Chaucer had written before 1390.⁵ What does he mention besides? Seven heroines,—Penelope, Helen, Hero, Laodamia, Dejanira, Hermione, and Briseis. Their legends, then, we may infer that Chaucer intended to write as opportunity offered,—prompted to this resolution (or confirmed in it) by the publication of the *Confessio* in 1390. If such was his purpose, there was no reason why he should not speak of

¹ That is, all except Cleopatra and Philomela (see p. 361, note 2, below).

² viii, 2647–56.

³ Vv. 2927 ff.

⁴ See Lowes, *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xix, 593 ff.; xx, 780 ff.; Tatlock, pp. 121–2; Root, p. 143.

⁵ There is nothing surprising in Chaucer's neglecting to mention, in the the Man of Law's introduction, two of the legends which he had already written—*Cleopatra* and *Philomela*. He was in no wise bound to compile a complete list.

these legends as already in existence. For of course they were going to be in existence (if he did not change his mind) long before that uncertain future date at which he hoped to publish the *Canterbury Tales* in its projected entirety. When that time should come, then, the words of the Man of Law would be justified, and there was no reason why they should be true at the moment at which Chaucer penned them. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that Chaucer had lived to finish the *Canterbury Tales*, and, in the mean time, had supplied the missing legends. Everything would then be in order. And it was with this consummation in mind that he wrote the words in question, — not with the purpose of instructing modern scholars in nice points of chronology. He was a poet, not a bibliographer.

¹ Even if Chaucer should never complete the *Legend*, he was well aware that he had mentioned Helen, Hero, and Laodamia in the *ballade*, and Dejanira and Briseis (with very brief summaries) in the *House of Fame* (vv. 397-8, 402-4), and that, besides referring to Penelope in the *ballade*, he had commended her "trouthe" in the *Troilus*, v. 1778 ("Penelope's trouthe and good Alceste"; see also *Anelida*, vv. 81-82). Thus, if worst came to worst, and he never finished the *Legend of Good Women*, he could allege that he had at least spoken of every one of the heroines whom the Man of Law names (save Hermione alone) — "if not in o book, then at all events 'in another.'" This, to my mind, seems quite conscientious enough for a humorist and the greatest of English *raconteurs*.

² Two of the legends that we have are ignored in the Man of Law's introduction, — *Cleopatra* (I) and *Philomela* (VII). Now, though the omission of *Philomela* might be explained by supposing (with Mr. Root) that it had not yet been written, no such explanation will apply to *Cleopatra*, which Mr. Root admits was already in existence. Let us be thankful for the omission of these two names, since it proves (for anybody who needs proof in such a case) that Chaucer was not aiming at frigid mathematical accuracy. For the same reason he does not mention the legends in the order in which they stand.

Mr. Root believes that "the *Legend of Good Women* was not authoritatively published during the poet's lifetime" (p. 152). None of his arguments seem to me to have any force. One of them, however, may be noted. It relates to the unfinished condition of *Hypermnestra*. "It is inconceivable," he says, "that [Chaucer] should have deliberately given out the

Our examination of the *Confessio Amantis* and of the Man of Law's introduction shows clearly that the accepted view (which dates the *Legend of Good Women*, as we have it, earlier than the beginning of the *Canterbury Tales*) accounts for all the phenomena without the least difficulty.

In conclusion, it may be worth while to adduce a piece of positive evidence, though at the expense of a little repetition.¹ Gower, as we have seen, gives, in less than fifty lines of the eighth book of his *Confessio*,² a list of eleven heroines who were crossed in love.³ The list not only stands in a portion of the *Confessio* which is designedly reminiscent of Chaucer's *Legend*, but it is followed almost immediately by the praise of the Four Chief Ladies,—one of them Alcestis. Further, in the list itself, Gower has adopted Chaucer's peculiar account of Cleopatra's death in the pit of serpents. Now this list might almost serve as a table of contents for the *Legend of Good Women*. Of Gower's eleven star-crossed heroines, *seven* have their stories told in the *Legend*,—Dido (iii),⁴ Phyllis (viii), Ariadne (vi), Medea (iv), Cleopatra (i), Thisbe (ii), and Philomela (vii). The only omissions are Hypsipyle (whom Chaucer unites with Medea in one continuous narrative in iv), Lucretia (v, omitted by Gower at this

ninth legend unfinished, when a dozen lines or so would have served to conclude it" (p. 151). Now the *story* of Hypermestra is complete. The legend ends (as we have it) with the first line of the *moral*:—"This tale is seid for this conclusioun."—Three to five lines would have sufficed to complete the application. The chances are that Chaucer *did* finish *Hypermestra*, and that we have lost these verses by accident. This is much more likely than that he should have left the legend at loose ends when ten or fifteen minutes with his facile pen would have remedied the defect.

¹ See Tatlock, pp. 128-9.

² VIII, 2550-96. Cf. p. 358, above.

³ I count Progne and Philomela as one, for obvious reasons.

⁴ I append the number of each story in Chaucer.

point in order to make her one of the Four Chief Ladies just below), and Hypermnestra (ix).¹

The *Confessio*, as we know, came out in 1390. Of course, Gower's list is not conclusive evidence, but it certainly tends to prove that the *Legend*, as we have it, existed before the Man of Law's introduction was written. In other words, it supports the obvious, accepted, and as yet unshaken thesis that the *Legend* preceded the *Canterbury Tales*.

G. L. KITTREDGE.

¹I make haste to add that Gower's list contains also the names of Deidamia, Dejanira, Canace, and Polyxena, whose legends Chaucer had not written, so that, if taken *ad amussim*, it proves too much. But, after all, Gower was not writing for strict bibliographical purposes !

ELEMENTARY FRENCH TEXTS

ALDRICH AND FOSTER'S ELEMENTARY FRENCH

Adopted for exclusive use in the University of Chicago.

Complete

Precise

Intelligible

Written according to the best modern methods of teaching French and planned to be easily adapted to the varying conditions of teaching the language.

SOME OF THE NEWEST FRENCH TEXTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL MODERN LANGUAGE SERIES

Féval—La Fée des Grèves

De Maistre—Les Prisonniers du Caucase

**Josselyn and Talbot—Elementary Reader of French
History**

Lazare—Les Plus Jolis Contes de Fées

Mérimée—Carmen and Other Stories

GINN AND COMPANY Publishers

Boston

New York

Chicago

London

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

JUST PUBLISHED.

Armstrong's Syntax of the French Verb.

By EDWIN C. ARMSTRONG, Professor in Johns Hopkins University.
With Exercises by DE LA WARR B. EASTER, Professor in Randolph-Macon College. ix + 192 pp. 12mo. 90 cents.

A manual which is sufficiently comprehensive to be used as a reference book and in which the material is so arranged that it can be used to good advantage in class, especially in connection with work in composition. Illustrative sentences are provided both to explain literary construction and to aid in using colloquial French.

Baumbach's Das Habichtsfräulein.

With introduction, notes and vocabulary and composition exercises by Dr. MORTON C. STEWART, Instructor in Harvard University. 92 pp. of text. 16mo. 40 cents.

A tale of peasant life in the Thuringian Forest and an excellent example of the *Dorfgeschichten*. The story is full of action, the character drawing is admirable and many of the peasant superstitions and legends are skilfully introduced in the development of the plot.

IN PRESS.

Bierwirth's Beginning German. New Edition.

By H. C. BIERWIRTH, Ph. D., Assistant Professor in Harvard University.

Wholly new sets of exercises have been provided, in addition to those in the present edition. They are intended to furnish practice in supplying endings, prefixes, suffixes, single words and phrases or single characteristic vowels, needed to complete easy sentences. Their value lies in fixing the student's attention upon the varying forms of words.

Minor changes have been made in the grammatical part of the new edition.

Claretie: Pierrille.

Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by H. A. SMITH, Professor in the University of Wisconsin, and Dr. CASIMIR ZDANOWICZ, Instructor in the same.

A pleasing tale of peasant life in Southern France, true to life, and told in an attractive, interesting way. The style is clear and easy.

Hugo: Ruy Blas. New Edition.

Edited by KENNETH MCKENZIE, Professor in Yale University.

Henry Holt and Company

34 West 33d St., New York

378 Wabash Ave., Chicago



Just Published

OSTHAUS AND BIERMANN'S GERMAN PROSE COMPOSITION

By CARL W. F. OSTHAUS, A. M., Junior Professor of German,
and ERNEST H. BIERMANN, Instructor in German,
Indiana University.

65 cents

A GRADED text-book of German writing, for high school and college use, based on consecutive prose and intended to develop rapidly the student's sense of independence. In the earlier portion the exercises consist of three parts—a short German selection, a set of questions in German based upon it, and an English version preceded by indications of the chief grammatical principles involved. As the selections increase in length, the questions are omitted, and in the second part only English material of higher grade is given. Throughout the exercises copious footnotes provide the needful suggestions and refer the students to sections of the digest of syntax which follows the text. The advanced portion offers a wide range of material, embracing legend, narrative, biography, and education, and descriptions of Cologne, Berlin, and Essen. Full vocabularies are supplied.

SERIES OF MODERN LANGUAGE TEXTS

French, forty-nine volumes; German, fifty-eight volumes; Spanish, thirteen volumes. Carefully edited for students of every grade. Include the most popular of those recommended by the Modern Language Association and the College Entrance Examination Board, together with new texts, distinguished by their freshness and originality.

*Our complete descriptive catalogue of
Modern Language Publications will be
gladly sent to any address on request.*

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO BOSTON

J. H. FURST COMPANY

PRINTERS OF

Philological and Scientific Works

ARE FULLY EQUIPPED WITH

**Special Types, Accents, etc., necessary to fill
orders promptly and accurately**

AMONG THE PUBLICATIONS PRINTED BY US ARE

THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN

TRANSACTIONS OF THE ACTUARIAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

And many other works of similar character

Special Attention given to the printing of

DOCTORS' DISSERTATIONS

**In Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Anglo-Saxon, Old English, and the
Romance and Germanic Languages**

CORRESPONDENCE INVITED

J. H. FURST COMPANY

23 S. Hanover Street

BALTIMORE, MD.

REGULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

1. Members wishing to present papers at the meeting are expected to prepare them for that particular purpose. Extremely technical treatises may be read by title. Subjects too large to be treated in an ordinary paper, and topics too special to be of general interest, may be brought before the meeting in the form of abstracts lasting from five to ten minutes. The papers read in full should be so constructed as not to occupy more than twenty (or, at most, thirty) minutes.

2. Every member offering a paper, whether it is to be read in full or not, shall submit to the Secretary, by November 15, with its title, a synopsis of its contents, consisting of some fifty or sixty words. He shall state, at the same time, whether he thinks his paper should be presented by title only, summarized in an abstract, or read in full. The synopses of accepted papers are to be printed on the program.

3. The Secretary shall select the program from the papers thus offered, trying to distribute the matter in such a way as to make all the sessions attractive. In general not more than an hour and a half shall be devoted to the presentation of papers at any one session. There shall be sufficient opportunity for discussion and for social intercourse.

4. The question of publication is to be decided for each paper on its merits as a contribution to science, without regard to the form in which it has been presented at the meeting.

NOTICE.

The Editorial Committee desires additional copies of Vol. xvii, No. 4, and will pay 75 cents for any copy of that number address to the Treasurer, Mr. W. G. HOWARD, 25 CONANT HALL, *Cambridge, Mass.*

**OFFICERS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICA FOR THE YEAR 1909.**

President, MARION DEXTER LEARNED, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Secretary, C. H. GRANDGENT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

*Treasurer, WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.,
Acting Secretary from July 10, 1909, to August 1, 1910.*

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

GUSTAV GRUENER, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

EVERETT WARD OLMSTED, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CENTRAL DIVISION.

Chairman, ARTHUR GRAVES CANFIELD, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Secretary, CHARLES BUNDY WILSON, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

AICÉE FORTIER, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.

CHARLES HARRIS, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

GEORGE HEMPL, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.

JOHN M. MANLY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

LEWIS F. MOTT, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

HENRY A. TODD, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

C. H. GRANDGENT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

CALVIN THOMAS, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

JAMES W. BRIGHT, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

SEP 8 1909
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
OF
AMERICA

EDITED BY
CHARLES H. GRANDGENT
SECRETARY OF THE ASSOCIATION

VOL. XXIV, NO. 3
NEW SERIES, VOL. XVII, NO. 3
SEPTEMBER, 1909

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE ASSOCIATION
AT 107 WALKER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
BOSTON POSTAL DISTRICT
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$3.00 A YEAR; SINGLE NUMBERS \$1.00
PRINTED BY J. H. FURST COMPANY
BALTIMORE

Entered November 7, 1902, at Boston, Mass., as second-class matter
under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

- XV.—The Fisher King in the Grail Romances. By WM. A. NITZE, - - - - - 365-418
- XVI.—The Liturgical Basis of the Towneley Mysteries. By F. W. CADY, - - - - - 419-469
- XVII.—The Family of Maurice Scève. By JOHN L. GERIG, - 470-475
- XVIII.—On the History of Palatal *h* in French with Special Reference to *o* and open *e*. By JOHN E. MATZKE, - - 476-493
- XIX.—*Ysopet III* of Paris. By MURRAY P. BRUSH, - - 494-546
- XX.—*Hudibras* in Germany. By HARVEY W. THAYER, - 547-584
-

The annual volume of the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* is issued in quarterly instalments. It contains chiefly articles which have been presented at the meetings of the Association and approved for publication by the Editorial Committee. Other appropriate contributions may be accepted by the Committee. The closing number of each volume includes, in Appendices, the Proceedings of the last Annual Meeting of the Association and its Divisions.

The complete sets of the first seven volumes of these Publications are all sold. The subsequent volumes, comprising all the New Series, may be obtained of the Secretary. The subscription for the current volume is \$3.00. The price of single numbers is \$1.00 each.

Copies of the Report of the Committee of Twelve on Admission Requirements may be obtained of the Secretary. The price is ten cents a copy.

In the absence of the Secretary, July 10, 1909, to August 1, 1910, all communications should be addressed to

W. G. HOWARD,
Acting Secretary of the Association,
25 Conant Hall, Cambridge, Mass.

The next Annual Meeting of the Association will be held at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., on December 28, 29, and 30. The Central Division Meeting will be held at the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., on the same days. Attention is called to the regulations printed on the third page of this cover.

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
Modern Language Association of America.
1909.

VOL. XXIV, 3.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XVII, 3.

XV.—THE FISHER KING IN THE GRAIL
ROMANCES.

I.

The nearer the knights of Arthur's Court approach the Grail, the more illusive and intangible the holy vessel appears. In Sir Percivale's own words:

"Lo, if I find the Holy Grail itself
And touch it, it will crumble into dust."

Thus one might say the Grail symbolizes in its evasiveness the problem of its own origin. For if its source is still to be sought, this is largely because the problem involved so easily eludes one's grasp. The difficulty is to fix the eye on the main issue, to the exclusion of secondary considerations. The Grail stories have been classed as Perceval and Galaad forms, as those in which a quest is the burden of the tale, as those in which it is the history of the sacred vessel itself. In but one feature do they agree, namely in describing a cult or ritual about an infirm person, whose cure apparently is to be effected. Tradition knows him as the Fisher King (*roi pêcheur*), but he is frequently called the Rich Fisher (*riche pêcheur*). It is the object of the present study to

follow up this character and his cult in order thus, if possible, to throw light on the Grail legend as a whole.

Of previous attempts to interpret the Fisher King, the views respectively of Nutt¹ and Heinzel² may be considered typical.³ Both scholars choose as the point of departure the wonderful fish which, in the *Joseph* attributed to Robert de Boron, Brons catches at the command of Joseph of Arimathea. In Robert the fish later serves to distinguish the sinners from the righteous, and in the *Grand St. Graal* it provides food for the sinners whom the Grail does not satisfy. Robert states that the fish was caught at Christ's will (v. 3310), and that Brons is to be known as the Rich Fisher (v. 3348). The two facts are plainly connected. In the *Grand St. Graal* the same epithet is borne by Alain, because it was at his prayer that Joseph multiplied the one fish so that it fed the host.

Guided by the name Bron, which he equates with Bran the Blessed of Welsh Legend, Nutt identifies⁴ the wonderful fish with the Salmon of Wisdom, appearing "prominently in Irish mythic lore." In the Boyish Exploits of Finn Mac

¹ *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, London, 1888, pp. 207-211; cf. G. Paris, *Rom.*, xviii, 588-590; H. Zimmer, *Gött. Gelehr. Anzeiger*, 1890, pp. 488-528; and Nutt, *Les derniers travaux allemands sur la légende du Saint Graal*, *Rev. Celtiq.*, xii, 181-228; cf. G. Paris, *Rom.*, xx, 504.

² *Ueber die französischen Gralromane*, Vienna, 1892, pp. 100-183; cf. H. Suchier, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, xvi, 269-274; E. Freymond, *Jahresbericht der rom. Philologie*, iii, Heft 2, 178-184.

³ See also the interesting treatise by A. N. Wesselofsky: *Zur Frage ueber die Heimath der Legende vom heiligen Gral* in *Archiv f. slav. Philologie*, xxiii (1901), 321-385. Its conclusions, however, are purely tentative, inasmuch as W. considers the question from the Orientalist point of view, and the emphasis is constantly on the *Joseph* and the *Grand St. Graal*.

For general bibliography see Ed. Wechssler, *Sage vom heiligen Gral*, Halle, 1898; W. Hertz, *Parzival, neu bearbeitet*, Stuttgart, 1898; E. Freymond, *Jahresbericht*, viii, Heft 2, 263-282.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 208-210.

Cumhail,¹ Finn seeks his námesake, Finn-eges, to learn poetry of him; Finn-eges had passed seven years by the river Boyne watching the salmon of Linn-Feic; finally Finn takes service with him and the salmon is caught. But Finn had been warned not to eat of it. This injunction he breaks inadvertently, and thereby becoming possessed of all knowledge, he is hailed as the successor of Finn. A similar tale is told in Welsh of Gwion,² who tastes of the cauldron of inspiration, also without intent, and who is thereupon reincarnated as Taliesin the bard. In short, according to Nutt, the wonderful fish of Robert is a Christian survival of a feature common to Celtic other-world tales, the magic food whereby a hero is made immortal, and which enables him to be re-born. Its guardian, the fisher, is, through the medium of Bran the Blessed, the representative of the Celtic god Cernunnos,³ "from whom, as Cæsar reports, the Gauls claim descent, and who as god of the otherworld and the shades was also god of knowledge and riches." In other words, the Fisher King is ultimately the Dis or Pluto of the Celtic otherworld.⁴

¹ Text by Kuno Meyer, *Revue Celtique*, v; discussion by Nutt, *Folk-Lore Record*, iv. Cf. also Campbell, *West Highland Tales*, vol. III, no. LVIII ('Rider of Grianraig'), where allusion is made to the "black fisherman working at his tricks," p. 15.

² Gwion and Fionn are parallel Brythonic and Goidelic forms. On Gwion, son of Nudd, see especially J. Loth, *Les Mabinogion*, Paris, 1889, I, p. 252, n.: "rien ne montre mieux l'évolution des personnages mythologiques." Nudd is the Welsh for the *Nodenti deo*, found in the inscriptions of Brittany. Gwion plays the same rôle among the Welsh as Nuada and the Tuatha Dé Danann in Ireland. The legend of St. Collen, cf. Llangollen in Denbigshire and Lan-golen near Quimper in Brittany, shows Christianity in contact with this powerful Celtic deity. See also Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures on Celtic Heathendom*, London, 1888, pp. 179-182, and *Arthurian Legend*, Oxford, 1891, pp. 155 ff.

³ Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, I, 993: "dieselbe wurzel wie latein. *cornu*, 'der gehörnte' = Dis pater bei Caes. B. G. 6, 18, dem Juppiter Cernenus der Römer entsprechend."

⁴ Rhys, *Hib. Lec.*, 84; also below, p. 379.

The objection to Nutt's hypothesis has been the apparent lack of strong evidence to support it. This Nutt at the outset himself admitted (p. 224). Too little seemed known about Bran the Blessed fully to justify the identification with Brons and his fish, especially since Celtic tradition contained no evidence that this fish was associated with Bran. According to a late triad he bears the epithet "Blessed" as one of those who first brought the Christian faith to the Cymri, and it may be that the title was thence carried over to the possessor of the cauldron, although we have no account of when and how this conversion took place. In addition, Zimmer¹ maintained that the salmon story is dubious evidence, inasmuch as the Finn-saga is relatively late and confined to Gaelic territory. And, lastly, we should have to assume that Joseph of Arimathea took over in large measure the rôle and characteristics of Brons, who plays the leading part in the other versions of the Grail story. Though these objections are mainly negative and do not disprove Nutt's argument, still his hypothesis has not been generally accepted.

And so we find Heinzel seeking firmer ground by explaining Brons and his fish entirely on a Christian basis.¹ The fish being a time-honored symbol of Christ (*Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς θεοῦ υἱὸς Σωτήρ*²), it is possible to assume that it once played a more important part in legend than is apparent from existing texts. On early Christian monuments the fish always figures upon the table of the faithful.³

¹ *Gött. Gel. Anzeige*, 1890, 429 ff.; *Zeit. f. deut. Alterthum*, xxxv, 155. See, however, *Revue Celtique*, xii, 189, xiii, 183.

² Heinzel, *Gralromane*, 96 ff.; Hertz, *Parzival*, 426-429.

³ H. Achelis: *Das Symbol des Fisches und die Fischdenkmäler der römischen Kutakomben*, Marburg, 1887; Wesselofsky, *op. cit.*, 337.

Further, see below, p. 391. A Syrian elaboration of the story of Tobias and his fish from the *Book of Tobit* is given by Wesselofsky, *op. cit.*, 338-340.

Christ Himself is known as a fisher, and the fishnet is the symbol of the Christian sermon. Instances might be multiplied (Hertz, 427). Whence it is argued that the reappearance of the fish on the Grail table is not a matter of chance ; for if the Grail stands for the communion-cup, the fish stands for the sacred wafer, and if the Grail symbolizes, with its contents, the Blood of the Lord, the fish symbolizes His Body.

Accordingly, the name Fisher King is connected with the words of the Saviour : "I shall make ye fishers of men" (*Matth.* iv, 19, *Mark* i, 17, *Luke* v, 10), and a rich fisher would be one who converts many. Such a one is evidently St. Peter, to whom certain of the *Apocrypha*¹ attribute a British mission, and of whom there was a tradition that when summoned to Rome to undergo martyrdom he founded the English church on the eve of his departure.² In the lapse of years these facts were obscured, so that the name reappears in the French Grail works shorn of its real meaning and referring to a king compelled by infirmity or by old age to renounce warfare and take up fishing. That is why the character in Crestien, Wolfram, *Didot-Perceval*, *Perlesvaus*, *Peredur*, and *Grand St. Graal*, fishes from a boat, while in Robert and the *Queste* versions this activity is not mentioned.

The last objection urged against the theory of Nutt holds here with equal emphasis. Joseph, not Brons, is the apostle to the British in the majority of Grail versions, and it is not clear how the substitution occurred. If Peter had been the original Rich Fisher, it is remarkable that his name is found

¹ Heinzel, *Grailromane*, 100, 183.

² *Vita Petri et Pauli*, *Acta Sanctorum*, Junius, v, 146 ; also Lipsius, *Die Apocry. Apostelgesch.*, Brunswick, 1887, II, 2, 148. Other material can be found in Krüger, *History of Early Christian Literature*, trans. by Gillett, New York, 1897, pp. 88-90.

only in Robert (and in the *Grand St. Graal*, which is based on Robert) and then not in that capacity—an attribute peculiar to Brons. Besides, if the present poem of Robert should be a second redaction,¹ the character of Peter might be an

¹ Gaston Paris and J. Ulrich, *Merlin* (Huth version), Paris, 1886, I, XXI, and Heinzel, *Gralromane*, 88–89, hold that Robert rewrote his own poem and that the present work is the second redaction. Suchier, *Zeit. rom. Philologie*, XVI, 270–271, and Wechssler, *Sage*, 125, believe he wrote but one redaction, the present poem. The passages upon which the argument rests are :

Vv. 931–936 :

Se je le grant livre n'avoie,
Ou les estoires sunt escrites,
Par les granz clers faites et dites :
La sunt li grant secré escrit,
Qu' en numme le Graal et dit ;

and vv. 3461 to the end :

Messires Roberz de Boron
Dist se ceci savoir voulun,
Sanz doute savoir convenra, etc.

Sommer, in his recent study : *Messire Robert de Borron u. der Verfasser des Didot-Perceval*, Halle, 1908 (*Beihefte zur Zeits.*, etc.), points out, p. 10, the difficulty of assuming that Robert intended his work to be followed by a 'Perceval' romance. But Sommer's general unreliability is again attested by the argument he bases on the year 1189 (p. 3) as the date when Gautier de Montbéliard left for the Holy Land. Gautier really left France for Italy in 1199, i. e., ten years later, and he did not embark for the Holy Land until 1201.

If Robert was an Anglo-Norman, as Suchier argues, then it might be wise to consider whether the poet who calls himself *je* in vv. 931, 3484, 3489, etc., is not to be distinguished from Robert—as the author of the *grant estoire du graal*, the remodeller of Robert, whose purpose may have been to bring Robert's simpler story into connection with a Perceval-Grail romance. The practice of other contemporary writers (for example, *Yvain*, vv. 6814 ff.), however, is a strong argument against this assumption. Thus Paris's view that Robert wrote in France (see esp. *Journal des Savants*, 1901, p. 708) is on the whole the most acceptable. But in that case, Robert himself was the author of the *grant estoire*, and his source, I take it, was the *grant livre* of v. 931—perhaps a Latin book? Is it not possible to connect the latter with Helinand's *hanc historiam latine scriptam*? I am inclined to date the *Joseph* about 1198; that is, the poem was begun at

addition made in the interests of the conversion story attached to his name. But this is equivalent to saying that Peter is not integrally connected with the Grail legend, and the epithet cannot be due to him. In any case it is natural to assume that the Biblical account of Peter's fishing induced Robert to set him by the side of the Rich Fisher, Brons.

But there is a more important circumstance which militates against the acceptance of Heinzel's theory: the Grail romances as a class have a heterodox tinge, which is not superficial. In Crestien and his continuators, including Wolfram, this trait is obvious; but the careful reader will discern it also in the most Christian forms of the story, where the Grail ceremony is compared to but is never identified with the actual celebration of the Eucharist.¹ Thus the Roman church never took cognizance of the existence of a Grail story, and the Grail works cannot be regarded as purely an ecclesiastical product, even when we recognize their proselyting spirit, and admit—as we do in the *Perlesvaus*—that they intentionally further a monastic cause.²

Montbéliard, while Gautier was still there, *en peis*, in a time of peace. This seems to me to be a likely interpretation of the well-known lines:

“ A ce tens que je la retreis
O mon seigneur Gautier en peis,
Qui de Mont-Belyal estoit,
Unques retraite esté n'avoit
La grant estoire dou Graal.”

I note that Heinzel, *op. cit.*, 113 would also interpret them in this way. But the date, 1201, he gives for Gautier's departure is wrong; at that time Gautier had left home.

¹ Heinzel, *op. cit.*, 179 and Martin, *Parzival u. Titurel*, 2nd part, Halle, 1903, L ff.

² *Modern Philology*, I, 257 ff. The first redaction of *Perlesvaus* was, I believe, composed in the interest of Glastonbury Abbey. It can be shown, too, that Glastonbury stood in intimate relationship with Fécamp, with which Miss Weston connected the Wauchier section of the *Conte del Graal* (*Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 1906, pp. 156 ff.). I shall return to this question later.

Now the least Christian feature in the legend is the Fisher King and his cult. The parallelism with Christ apparently stops with the name Fisher. If we disregard for the moment the version of Robert, the ritual in which he appears is certainly not founded on the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper; and the striking features of it have no immediate counterpart in Christian or Biblical lore.¹ The true explanation I believe is to be sought elsewhere. Before proceeding further, however, it will be well to grasp clearly his salient traits as they present themselves in the various versions of the legend.

The following abbreviations will be used :

- C. Crestien, before 1180.²
- W. Wolfram, about 1217.³
- Wa. Wauchier de Denain.⁴
- G. Gerbert de Montreuil.⁵
- M. Manessier.⁶
- R. Robert de Boron.⁷

¹ I do not wish to imply that the Eucharist and the Grail ceremony may not go back to similar primitive rites ; see Eisler, *Origins of the Eucharist*, cited below.

² Wechssler, *Sage*, 148 ff. The *Conte del Graal* is dedicated to Philip of Flanders. Inasmuch as Philip was a patron of letters (cf. Brakelmann, *Les plus anciens chansonniers français*, 1891, p. 13), Crestien's praise of him requires no special explanation. Thus we can agree with Gaston Paris (*Journal des Savants*, 1902, p. 305), that the poem was written about 1175.

³ Martin, *Parzival*, p. xiii.

⁴ Paul Meyer, *Rom.*, xxxii, 583. For the best synopsis see Jessie L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, London, 1906, ch. II. Wauchier also translated a series of Saints Lives for Philip, Marquis de Namur. I do not here distinguish between Wauchier and Pseudo-Wauchier (see Heinzel, *op. cit.*), as I am not yet prepared to take sides on the question ; see Jeanroy, *Revue des lang. rom.* (1907), L, 541-544.

⁵ Also author of the *Conte de la Violette* ; see Kraus, *Ueber Gerb. de Montreuil*, 1897 ; Wilmotte, *Gerb. de M. et les écrits qui lui sont attribués*, Brussels, 1900, and Gröber's *Grundriss*, II, 509.

⁶ Martin, *op. cit.*, p. li.

⁷ Cf. above ; the abbreviation (R.) will be used only for the Metrical Joseph.

E. Elucidation to the *Conte del Graal*.

Q. *Queste* (Furnivall).

D. *Didot-Perceval*, corrected by the Modena MS.

Perl. *Perlesvaus*, about 1200.

GS. *Grand St. Graal* (Hucher).

K. *Diu Crône*, about 1215.¹

P. *Peredur ab Ewrawc*.²

(a) NAME: As was said above, R. employs the name *riche pêcheur*, which he gives solely to Brons. C. generally uses *roi pêcheur*.³ The two names are so similar, and are so often confused in the MSS., that it is impossible to base a sharp distinction upon them. Yet C. and his continuators (one might except G.) evidently prefer the title *roi pêcheur*, whereas E., Q., GS., employ mostly *riche pêcheur*, and D. has first *riche pêcheur*, but later in the episode resembling the Grail Visit in C., it uses *roi pêcheur*. The matter may depend, as Heinzel suggests, upon whether the "fishing" or the "kingship" is uppermost in the mind of the poet. Possibly there was a time when both concepts were equally strong: cf. C., v. 4673—*le rice roi Pescéour*. This seems plausible: the character was originally both a fisher and a king; for it is conceivable that R. with his evident desire to theologize omitted the kingship and emphasized the fishing.⁴

(b) INFIRMITY: The Fisher King is either very old or ill; that, at least, is the general conception of him. For if R. says nothing of either trait, it is incredible that he considered Brons other than old, inasmuch as he is to hand the Grail to his grandson, Perceval. In C., M., W., GS., Q., Perl., and P.,⁵ it is clearly stated that he is ill; the illness is

¹ J. H. F. Scholl, *Litt. Verein*, CXVI, Stuttgart, 1873.

² J. Loth, *Les Mabinogion*, Paris, 1889, vol. II.

³ See, however, v. 7791, *Et del rice Pesceour croi*.

⁴ Perl. seems to follow C.: *li rois Peschierres* (Pot. I, 2), *au riche roi Peschéor* (Pot. I, 15).

⁵ Also in Rochat's *Perceval*, Zurich, 1855.

related in some way with the Grail question ; either it will be dispelled by asking the question, or, as in Perl., it springs from the fact that the question is not asked. In E., Wa., and G., however, the Fisher King is not himself ill, but his land lies waste (so in GS. because of Bruillan's blow),¹ and its restoration depends on the asking of the question. In D. he is both old and infirm :² a combination of the two ideas.

The illness is usually due to a wound. In C., M., and GS. the wound was inflicted with a spear thrust through the thighs (C., v. 4691 *parmi les hances ambedeus*). In W., and Q.,³ it is caused by the lance, though in W. it is not the lance of Longinus.⁴ In Q., GS., and G., Evalach-Mordrain⁵—a parallel to the Fisher King's father—is covered with wounds. In Wa., M., Q.,⁶ GS., the Fisher King has a relative, usually a brother,⁷ who has been killed by a sword, whereby the fruitfulness of the country has also been destroyed—this sword the Grail hero pieces together.

(c) DOUBLE OR COUNTERPART. In most versions the Fisher King has by his side a mysterious person, who also awaits the Grail hero, and whom in C. and W. the Grail particularly serves.⁸ As a rule he is a relative : in C., W.,

¹ Compare the blow struck by Balan in Malory's Paraphrase of the *Huth-Merlin* ; G. Paris and J. Ulrich, *op. cit.*, II, 28.

² When cured he is *revenus en sa juvence* ; cf. W.

³ Likewise in the *Prose Tristan* (ed. Löseth, *Bibl. Ec. des haut. étud.*, 82), Paris, 1890.

⁴ In the *Huth-Merlin* Pellehan is wounded by the lance of Longinus. The lance was regarded in the north as the immediate cause of Jesus's death : *Evangelium Nicodemi*, ed. Tischendorf, ch. VII ; Bugge-Schofield, *Home of the Eddic Poems*, London, 1899, Introd. 43 ff. ; Heinzel, *op. cit.*, 9.

⁵ Rhys identifies *Evalach* with Welsh *Avallac*, *Avallon* ; *Arth. Legend*, 324. Rightly, I believe.

⁶ In Q. even Joseph of Arimathea has been wounded through the thighs.

⁷ In Q. and GS. he is Lambar, the father of the Lame King, Pellean.

⁸ C., v. 6039, *Quel rice home on en servoit* ; Heinzel, *op. cit.*, 5.

G., Q. and GS. the Fisher King's father.¹ In Wa., (apparently also E.) he seems to be the dead knight on the bier. The rôle, it seems, is taken by Petrus in R. and also by Evalach-Mordrain in GS. It would seem that the head on the salver in P. belongs to this person.²

(d) *ABODE*: He resides at the Grail castle, the other-world nature of which is admitted. In Perl. it bears the names *Edein*, *Chastiax de Joie*, and *Chastiax des a(r)mes*,³ perhaps directly due to Glastonbury influence. In Q., and GS. it lies in the *terre foraine (sauvage)*, in K. in *Illes*. It is found by chance, rarely before nightfall; and on the morning following the visit it has vanished (Wa.), or become deserted. In many versions it lies beyond a river, behind a mountain; cf. C., W., P., D., Perl. In order to reach it, the hero at times needs a "helpful animal"⁴—for example, a white mule—which carries him safely over a dangerous bridge, resembling the well-known soul-bridge⁵ (Wa.,⁶ and

¹ In M. the Fisher King has a brother, Goon Desert; in Perl. also the *Rois du Chastel Mortel*. Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 118 ff., identifies the two, since Partinal in M. is apparently based on Perceval, Parzival. In other words, M. and Perl. contain the *motif* of the King of the Waste City, who is naturally opposed to the Fisher- (or Life-, see below) King. As to the 'double,' there seems to be a confusion in M., for Goon appears also to be the equivalent of Gonemans in C. In Perl., on the other hand, the 'double' is certainly the knight in the *tonnel* on the monks' island (Pot, I, 328), and his name may possibly be Evalach, i. e., Welsh Avallac, Aval-lon. Cf. note 5, p. 374.

² In Perl. (Pot., I, 128) the damsel in the boat with the Fisher carries a truncated human head. For the complex relationships in Q. and GS., see Heinzel, *op. cit.*, 143 and *passim*.

³ Pot., I, 249.

⁴ On the 'helpful animal' as distinguished from the 'grateful animal,' see O. M. Johnston, *Zeit. franz. Spr. u. Lit.*, xxxi, 158 ff.

⁵ The bridge is of glass or ice, or it is a sword. On the last idea, cf. *Kulhwch and Olwen*, Loth, *Mabinogion*, I, where a dagger serves as a crossing for the armies of Britain; also G. Paris, *Rom.*, xii, 508 ff.; E. J. Becker, *Mediæval Visions of Heaven and Hell*, Baltimore, 1899, pp. 17, 44, 76, 85; Lucy A. Paton, *Fairy Mythol. of Arth. Romance*, Boston, 1903, p. 85, note.

⁶ Second Grail Visit.

Perl.¹). In the C. versions the Grail knight is directed to it by the Fisher King, whom he finds fishing in a boat; elsewhere more mysterious means are employed, such as "two children in a tree" (D.) and "a chapel of the black hand" (Wa., Q.). In Perl., Q., and GS., the final sanctuary of the Grail is beyond the sea (*terra repromissionis* or Sarras).

Agreeing with the otherworld traits is the fact that the Fisher King has the power to shift his shape, so common a feature in Irish and Welsh folk-lore.² (In E. we read: "a hundred times he changed his semblance.") Also, that in Perl. he is combatted by the king of the Dead Castle, who has stolen the Grail, and in E. by King Amangons³ who violated the guardians of the springs so that the land became barren and the Court of the Rich Fisher, "which had filled the land with plenty and splendour,"⁴ could no more be found.

(e) HIS PART IN THE GRAIL RITUAL. As was stated before, the Fisher King, not Perceval, Galaad, Bors, Lancelot or Gawain—all of whom behold the Grail (in Perl., even Arthur)—is the figure about whom the Grail ceremony centers. His life and happiness depend upon the success of the ceremony; for when the "quest" is truly completed, he is either restored to health and prosperity or his suffering finds relief in death. Then, too, the barren soil becomes productive, and in D. and Q. it is said "the enchantments of Great Britain and of the whole world cease."⁵ Indeed,

¹Second Grail Visit.

²See A. C. L. Brown, *Iwain*, 1903 (*Harvard Studies*, VIII), p. 42. The trait is characteristic of Manannán Mac Lir, but others possess it as well, cf. Rhys, *Celtic Folk-Lore*, Oxford, 1901, II, ch. XI, and below.

³In the *Chev. as deus espees* (ed. Foerster, 1877), v. 12121, Amangons is ruler of the "land whence no one returns"; so also Baudemagus in *Crestien's Charrete*, v. 201.

⁴Nutt, *op. cit.*, 8.

⁵*Ibid.*, 32; Hucher I, 484.

in Perl. the moral languor of the Arthurian Court springs from the failure at the *ostel au riche roi Peschéor*.¹

It is not necessary to discuss here in detail the Grail and the sacred objects or relics surrounding it.² Suffice it to mention that beside the Grail and the lance, a sword, several plates (in W. "knives") and in two versions (E. and Wa.) a silver cross are carried in the Grail procession. Since the Fisher King's wound,³ however, is ascribed to the lance,⁴—in W. the lance is known from this fact alone,—it is necessary to consider somewhat its part in the ceremony.

In seven out of twelve versions the lance precedes the Grail; in not all of these does it "drip" blood. C., notably, calls it *la blanche lance* in spite of its bleeding, and in W. the blood on it comes from the Fisher King's wound. But in only one of the five versions in which the lance follows the Grail, does its blood flow into the holy vessel (Perl.), and there it is to be noted that the Fisher King is not wounded but infirm because of the Grail Knight's previous failure. The fact that the lance does not occur at all in R., while in P. it alone occurs without the Grail, and in C. Gawain undertakes a separate quest to find it, shows clearly that Grail and lance are not as intimately associated as is sometimes supposed.⁵ It is conceivable, in fact, that at one time the lance was as important as the Grail; in two versions (W. and P.), at least, its independence of the Grail is seen in the lamentations accompanying its appearance, which subside before the Grail is brought in.⁶ Robert, as

¹ *Old French Grail Romance Perlesvaus*, Baltimore, 1902, pp. 44 ff.

² See summary of Heinzel's *Grailromane*.

³ E., Wa., M. and D. alone mention Longinus (*Longis*).

⁴ But not in C; there it is due to a *gaverlot*, v. 4690. See above.

⁵ Heinzel, *op. cit.*, 10, mentions an "ursprüngliche Selbständigkeit der Lanze."

⁶ In E. the Grail Damsel mourns; see Nutt, *op. cit.*, 9, also W.

will be recalled, is the first to speak of *the* Grail ; to Crestien the word *graal* was still a common noun.

Thus the following sequence suggests itself:

1. The Grail story deals primarily with the cure of a mysterious being: the Fisher King, Rich Fisher, or Rich Fisher King.

2. His suffering, reflected in the barrenness of his land or even of Great Britain, is due to several causes. In the first place, however, to a lance or spear which has been thrust through his thighs.

3. His cure and the restoration of his land depend on the success of a ceremony in which a certain question is to be asked.

4. This ceremony consists in part of a procession before the king, in which a lance, in some cases the one with which his wound has been inflicted, and a food-giving vessel are shown, together with other sacramental objects.

5. It takes place in an abode with otherworld traits, such as remoteness, difficulty of approach (lying beyond the water), invisibility, and the like.¹

6. The cure is effected by a youth endowed with special qualities: strength (P.), wisdom (C.), humility (W.), and purity (Q.).

7. When successful, the latter shares in the Fisher King's mysterious existence and is considered the possessor of certain important secrets.¹

8. The Fisher King has a companion or double, from whom he cannot be dissociated. When living, this companion is sustained in a supernatural way; in C. by the Grail.

9. The ceremony often begins with lamentations (Wa., W., P.), and concludes, if a success, with rejoicing.²

¹ Specifically in the R. group.

² Cf. the *Chastiax de Joie* in Perl., Pot. I, 91.

For the purpose of argument I shall assume that the Fisher King is an otherworld being, a sort of intermediary between this world and the next; this his character in general would indicate, especially in the light of recent investigations,¹ and then the fact that his kingdom is accessible over a very narrow bridge. Through him mortal man gains knowledge of the secrets of existence. But Nature herself is dependent on him; for when his power wanes,² the country is laid waste and the soil rendered sterile. In order to restore his strength or that of his double,³ certain rites are

¹ See below, pp. 380 ff.; also Nutt, *Studies*, ch. VII.

² This trait seems to me to be fundamental. Consult Frazer, *Lectures on the Early History of Kingship*, 89 ff. The motif of the 'Lame King' pertains to the same idea. His name is Pellean, which possibly represents a confusion of Pelles and Alain (R.), for in the *Vulgate Quest* he is also the father of Perceval; cf. below, p. 398, n. 5, on the *πατήρ* in the Mediterranean cults. In the *Domanda* and the *Huth-Merlin* Perceval's father is Pellinor; in the latter romance (I, 258) it is he who pursues the *diverse beste*, as Arthur does the *porcus troit* in Nennius (Dottin, *Religion des Celtes*, Paris, 1904, p. 28), an animal generally known as the *beste glatissant*. On this animal, see Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 154 and Wesselofsky, *op. cit.*, 378-381; to all appearances it is a totem-animal, dating from the 'zoöomorphic' period among the Celts; see Salomon Reinach, *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, Paris, 1906, vol. II, pp. 83-122: "La Mort d'Orphée."

Pellean's wound is inflicted by Balaain, according to Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 297, n. < Celtic Belinos; cf. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, Bäl-ëno-s, Old Irish gval = *brennen*, compared by the Romans to 'Apollo.' Balaain wields the *lanche vencheresse*, *Huth-Merlin*, II, 7, 27, which had belonged to Longinus (cf. below, p. 404), and which he finds on a golden table beside a marvelous bed on which lies Joseph of Arimathea. See Heinzel, *Grälromane*, 174, 66-67, note. Pelles, with Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 283, I have previously equated with Welsh Pwyll, a name which also occurs in Brittany; see Loth, *Les Mabinogion*, Paris, 1889, I, 27. My argument can be found in *Modern Philology*, I, 252-254. Cf. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, s. v. Pëllus, Ir. Cíall = *Verstand*, W. Pwyll; so Pelles might mean the 'wise one.'

³ In Q., as I pointed out, p. 375, the double is Pellean (*roi méhaignié*). Perhaps Q. thus retains a primitive trait; or is the double himself a secondary personage? See Heinzel's argument, *Grälromane*, 12, and below, p. 398, on what is said concerning the Greek *πατήρ*.

required, which become efficacious when shared in by a person whose qualifications have been tested. The latter, the Grail Knight, is thereby made immortal and becomes the Fisher King's successor. The epithet "rich," doubtless applied early to the Fisher King, is possibly emblematic of his creative function,¹ though it is of course a royal epithet.

The suggestion I make is not in itself new. As far back as 1842, Simrock² in his notes to San Marte's translation of W. suggested that the basis of the Grail concept, like the motive of the St. John-Herodias story, is the "reproductive power of the blood of the slain god (Odin-Hachelbrand, Baldur, Adonis, Osiris)." Martin,³ writing in 1880 in support of the Celtic hypothesis, identifies the Fisher King with Arthur passing a charmed life in Avalon, and sees in both the myth of the summer god banished by the forces of winter. Heinzel, too, mentions the life-cult element but regards it as unessential.⁴ To Miss Weston belongs the credit of setting it in its proper place, though she confines herself practically to one version of the legend, and emphasizes, to my mind, a secondary matter, namely, the possibility of explaining the Grail and Lance as phallic symbols.⁵ In addition, Staerk⁶ has pointed out an eastern parallel to

¹ *Riche* in Old French of course connotes 'power.'

² K. Simrock, *Parcival und Titirel, uebersetzt u. erläutert*, Stuttgart, 1842-76. The Herodias tale merits a separate study in this connection. In Perl. Gawain's sword is that whereby John the Baptist was beheaded; W. brings Prester John into his work, even if he leaves out the Baptist; Kundry, according to Wagner, is Herodias. Cf. Nutt, *op. cit.*, 100.

³ *Zur Gralsage (Quellen u. Forschungen, XLII)*, Strassburg, 1880; also *Zeit. deutsch. Alterthumskunde*, 1878, 84 ff.

⁴ *Gralromane*, see summary; also 70-72.

⁵ *Folk-Lore*, XVIII (1907), 283-305.

⁶ *Ursprung der Grallegende*, Tübingen, 1903. See the interesting review of Staerk's study by Konrad Burdach in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, XXIV (1903), 3050-3058. Of particular value, for the literary development of the legend, are his remarks on the *introitus* in the Greek church

the Fisher King in Adapa the Wise, the son of Eas lord of Eridu "at the mouth of the rivers," who serves his father with bread and water and carries on fishing upon the sea; the story is a part of the Hades-Paradise myth of the Babylonians.¹ But that the Fisher King is the central figure of the Grail story, and thus probably the crux of the Grail problem, can, I believe, be shown by a comparison with the Mysteries of Antiquity. In making such a comparison the prime object is to ascertain, if possible, the organic meaning of the Grail theme; in other words, to define the situation which produced it, and not to determine, except indirectly, its historic origin,—that I shall leave for a second study. Though we now know that the cults of Mithra, Isis, and the Great Mother (Cybele) were carried into Gaul and even Britain in the stream of Roman colonization, and that Mithraism in the form of Manicheism had a recrudescence in France in the heresies of the Middle Ages,² yet it is doubtful whether these influences were operative in forming the Grail legend, though they might have been a contributing element, especially later on. *A priori*, as we shall see, it is likely that the resemblances to which I am about to call

("fraglos antiken Mysterienprozessionen nachgebildete Pompa des Introitus") and on the presence of the lance in eastern ecclesiastical rites—on this point see Heinzel, *op. cit.*, 9. Burdach promises to consider the origin of the literary form of the Grail story ("doch wohl in der Provence oder deren Nachbarschaft") in his "demnächst erscheinenden Buche." This line of investigation seems to me especially promising with respect to W; in fact, to all of the later works with oriental coloring. But I do not see its bearing on C., Wa., E., Perl., or indeed R. itself.

¹ Meissner, *Babylonische Bestandteile in mod. Sagen u. Gebräuchen* in *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, v, 219.

² See F. Cumont, *Textes et Monuments relatifs au culte de Mithra*, Brussels, 1899, I, 349. And Professor F. M. Warren gives me the following references: Ademar de Chabannes, *Chronique*, III, chapters 49 and 59; Raoul Glaber, *Historiae* (in the *Collection pour servir à l'étude*, etc.), ed. Prou, 1886, II, ch. 11; III, ch. 8.

attention are the result of similar circumstances of living and surroundings. As M. Reinach¹ says: "Il est singulier que l'exégèse mythologique se soit complu à expliquer les ressemblances par des emprunts bien plus longtemps que la linguistique. Pour justifier le recours à cette hypothèse, il ne suffit pas de la constatation d'une ressemblance entre deux mots ou deux mythes: il faut tout un faisceau d'analogies et d'homophonies."

II.

Mysteries of a sacramental kind were celebrated over almost the whole ancient world.² They were in fact the typical religious expression of the peoples of the eastern periphery of the Mediterranean. But whatever their various origins were;³ and to whatever degree they may have interacted and been assimilated to each other, in Greece their most distinctive form⁴ must be sought in connection with

¹ *Op. cit.*, 89.

² Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, vol. III, Oxford, 1907, p. 143: "Mystery-cults may be regarded as an ancient heritage of Mediterranean religion."

³ On the distribution of Oriental cults, especially in the West, see F. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, Paris, 1907, and C. H. Moore, in *Publ. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, xxviii (1908), 109 ff.

⁴ I have sought to secure the authenticity of my evidence by taking it from authorities recognized as such in a field which I am myself unable to control. And I have endeavored further to ascertain the validity of their results by reference to O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie u. Religionswissenschaft*, Munich, 1906, and his *Jahresbericht* for 1898-1905, vol. 137, Leipzig, 1908. The former work is part of I. von Müller's *Handbuch der klass. Alterthumswissenschaft* and will be cited by the abbreviation *Hdb.* W. H. Roscher's *Lexikon der griech. u. röm. Mythologie* and Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der class. Wissenschaften* were freely consulted.

Besides these authorities, the following works were used on Eleusis in particular: P. Foucart, *Recherches sur l'origine et la nature des mystères d'Éleusis* in *Acad. d. inscr. et belles lettres*, xxxv (1896) and xxxvi (1900); *idem*, *Le Culte de Dionysos en Attique* in *ibid.*, xxxvii (1906); G. Anrich,

the worship of Demeter-Kore at Eleusis, in Egypt with Osiris and Isis, in Syria with Adonis or Tammuz,¹ in Phrygia with Attis,² and in imperial Rome with the light-god Mithra.³ It must be noted also that the cult of Orpheus—or Orphism⁴—was a powerful factor in the Greek world,

Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christenthum, Göttingen, 1894, and finally vol. III of L. R. Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States*, Oxford, 1907.

¹On Osiris and Adonis see especially: J. G. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, London, 1906; Maspero, *Études de Mythologie*, 4 vols., Paris, 1893 ff.; Erwan, *Die Aegyptische Religion*, Berlin, 1904; C. Vellay, *Le Culte et les Fêtes d'Adonis*, Paris, 1904 (this last with caution).

²On Attis, besides Frazer's work: H. Hepding, *Attis, seine Mythen u. sein Kult*, Giessen, 1903; Showermann, *The Great Mother of the Gods* (Bulletin 43 of Univ. of Wisconsin), Madison, 1901.

³On Mithra, the monumental work of F. Cumont, *Textes et Monuments relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, 2 vols., Brussels, 1894–1900; Roeses, *Ueber Mithradienst*, Stralsund, 1905; Salomon Reinach, *La morale du Mithraïsme in Cultes, mythes et religions*, II, 1905, pp. 220 ff. An important work is also that of Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, Leipzig, 1903, though D.'s conclusions have not proved wholly acceptable; see especially Reitzenstein, *Neue Jahrb. f. das class. Alterthum*, 1904, p. 192; also Gruppe's *Jahresbericht*.

⁴On Orpheus, especially Roscher, *Lexikon der Mythologie*, and several articles by S. Reinach in vol. II of his *Cultes, mythes et religions*.

The background of Orphism seems to have been the murder and resurrection of Zagreus, the 'horned serpent.' We should note especially the kinship which Reinach points out, p. 58 ff., of this myth with that depicted in Gaul upon the altar of Mavilly and on other monuments presumably of Celtic origin, including the famous vase of Gundestrup (*Revue Archéol.*, 1891, pp. 1–6; *ibid.*, 1897, pp. 313–326; *idem*, *Bronzes figurés*, 195). In this connection, Nutt's identification of our Fisher King with the Gallic deity Cernunnos (Gr. Κάρνυ) 'the horned one,' attains fresh interest; see above, p. 367.

Finally, mention must be made of Robert Eisler's researches in connection with the Eucharist, and the etymology he proposes for Orpheus < ὀρφος meaning "fish," Orpheus being a "regular derivation from this old noun and meaning the 'fisher.'" A short article from his pen, *The Origins of the Eucharist*, was published under section VIII of the International Congress of Religions held in Oxford last September (1908), and more is to follow, I understand, from the press of Beck and Co., Munich.

The standard work on Orphism seems to be Ernst Maas, *Orpheus, Untersuchungen zur griech. römisch. altchrist. Jenseitsdichtung u. Religion*, Munich, 1895; cf. E. Rohde, *Psyche*, 2nd ed., 1898, II, 107 ff.

giving rise to the so-called Orphic literature, a part of which is preserved in the Orphic Hymns—though its origin as well as that of Orphism itself is by no means clear. Taking the Eleusinia as a type, for scholars seem agreed that they were both agrarian and mystic from the start, we may say the mysteries in general served a double purpose: first, to induce through a sacrificial feast the fructification of nature; secondly, to initiate the human soul into the secret of life by bringing it, as it were, into relationship with the life deity. These two features, of course, were not present to an equal degree in all the cults that went under the name of mysteries. Besides, in the genuine mysteries, where they are found, the ‘mystic’ aspect is to be variously interpreted. It would be wrong, for example, to claim that it necessarily consisted in a distinct doctrine of immortality. If the soul was really to obtain through the mystery in a small degree what it was naturally in quest of,—the Homeric hymn says: “happy is he who has seen these mysteries: but he who has no share in them has by no means an equal lot in the darkness of the dead,”—it is highly probable that this concept varied with time and place, and we should guard against confusing our Christian notions with it.¹ Nevertheless, since the mystery was obviously a life-cult, it is only natural to assume that it had a special sacramental significance for those initiated into it, if not at once, then in an increasing degree with the progress of human civilization.

The scope and importance of the Eleusinia, however, are fairly well known. According to Gruppe,² they sprang from a desire to protect the crops against harmful spirits, the guardian invoked being Demeter, with whose epithet Eleutho (= ‘deliverer’) he considers the name Eleusis connected.³

¹ Farnell, III, 192 and *passim*.

² *Hdb.*, 48–58; here a special bibliography will be found.

³ “Eine andere Form für Eileithgia . . . im Altherthum wahrscheinlich also Löserin gedeutet.”

He regards the worship of Demeter as indigenous in Crete, where, as in Eleusis, it was linked with the cult of Zeus Kataibatos¹—a sort of Pluto—and was celebrated at the entrance to a cave or rift in the earth. Whatever may be the validity of this view, Demeter, as Farnell² states, evidently had “as an accessory in the background, the ravisher and husband, the god of the lower world, by whatever name he was called.” Thus her worship had early to do with a knowledge of the hereafter. One of its early features was the quarterly plowing or tilling of the soil, corresponding later to the three blossomings of the Narcissus. By the eighth century the Demeter cult, it seems, had been expanded to agree with Boeotian traditions, such as the Rape of Persephone and the tale of Demeter’s wanderings—though Farnell points out that Kore and not Persephone “was the official name for the daughter at Eleusis.” In the fifth Homeric hymn we have an account of an annual festival at Eleusis with combats, races, and a procession; a funeral service at the spring Parthenion, and a feast preceded by fasting, at the so-called “laughless rock,” the ἀγέλαστος πέτρα, the favorite seat of Demeter. Helios now directs Demeter on her way, and illumines with his rays the souls of mortals so that they become ἐπόπται or “seers”; a stage which the neophyte, however, could not enter upon until after a year’s waiting or until he had passed through a second celebration.³ Presently Poseidon⁴

¹ *Hdb.*, § 68: “Kataibatos, eines in der Tiefe hausenden Gottes, dessen Hilfe man anrief, um Regen u. Gewitter heraufzubeschwören, weshalb man ihm auch dem Zeus Keraunios gleichsetzte”—thus another vegetation god.

² *Op. cit.*, 134.

³ Farnell, *op. cit.*, p. 173; Foucart, *Recherches, passim*.

⁴ See especially Farnell, vol. iv, 36—where the belief is expressed that the cult-title is the ancestral patronymic of the clan; see, however, below, in the discussion of Attis, who has the same title.

makes his appearance at Eleusis—with the epithet ‘father,’ which has been variously interpreted as expressing the belief that Persephone was his daughter or that he was the ancestor of the famous Eleusinian clan, the Eumolpidae, in whose hands lay “the mystic celebration itself and the formal privilege of admission,” though the Kerykes also had a share in this. But inasmuch as Poseidon was “the fertilizing water-god,” his appearance by the side of Demeter, however secondary it may be, seems accounted for, and the epithet applied to him may be attributed to his function as a ‘creative’ god.

Thus, in short, the Eleusinia grew in importance until by the fifth century B. C., if not earlier, they attained Panhellenic renown.¹

From the sacramental point of view the mystery was an initiation entailing certain requirements on the neophyte or initiate. What these were is not absolutely certain. Yet there exist two statements, at least, in pagan writers which suggest a kind of moral scrutiny.² Libanus reports that the candidates ‘must be pure in hand and soul and of Hellenic speech’; and Origen quoting from Celsus affirms that “those who invite people to other mysteries (as distinct from the Christian) make the proclamation, ‘(come all ye) who are pure of hand and of intelligible speech.’” Without by any means affirming that he who desired to enter the mysteries must have ‘put on incorruption,’—for to quote Rohde:³ “es war ein sanfter Ausblick, nicht eine an sich ziehende, aus dem Leben ziehende Aufforderung,”—we may still say that the moral injunction here is clear, though originally it may have been mainly ritualistic.⁴ And the reference to the neophyte’s speech can have no other than ceremonial value,

¹ Farnell, III, 156; also Rohde, *Psyche*, 2nd ed., I, 282 ff.

² Farnell, III, 166.

³ *Op. cit.*, I, 300.

⁴ Farnell, III, 168.

either excluding Barbarians or implying that ceremonial words are operative only when spoken intelligibly.¹ So, too, the hierophant, as the celebrant was called from the *ἱερά* (sacred objects), was vowed to continual chastity. In fact, so sacred was his person and manner of life that no one ever ventured to address him by his personal name. He was always a member of the Eumolpidae, who thus illustrated the principle of apostolic succession. "It was he who was said to 'reveal the orgies,' 'to show the things of mystery.' He alone could penetrate into the innermost shrine, the *μέγαρον* or the *ἀνάκτορον*, in the hall of mysteries, whence, at the most solemn moment of the celebration, his form suddenly appeared transfigured in light before the rapt gaze of the initiated."²

The hierophant also took a leading part in the mystic play that was enacted. This seems to have been virtually a representation of the local Demeter myth, the theme of which was probably the loss of the daughter, the sorrow of the mother, and the ultimate recovery of the lost one—to the mystic perhaps an image of the course of the human soul after death. In close connection with the drama, probably interwoven with it, were a feast and a sacred procession.³

The former, which was preceded by fasting, consisted of the consumption of some *κυκέων* (a drink) and a bread or cake from a sacred basket, known in Eleusis as *κάλαθος*. "In drinking the *κυκέων*," says Farnell,⁴ "the *mystae* drank of the same cup as the goddess drank of when at last she broke her nine days' fast in the midst of her sorrow, and the antiquity of this ritual is attested by the Homeric hymn." The basket, however, was known by other names in other

¹*Idem*, 167 ; Foucart, *Recherches*, 33.

²Farnell, III, 156.

³Foucart, *Recherches*, 63 ; Gruppe, *l. c.*

⁴*Op. cit.*, 186 and discussion in *Hdb.*

places; as *λίκνον* in the separate Dionysos mysteries, *ἐλένη* in the Artemis rites, etc. But at Eleusis it was probably subordinate to the *κίστη* which also contained bread, but rather as the symbol of the life-giving god, since *κίστη* is emblematic of the mysteries as a class,¹ just as the Grail stands for the ceremony associated with it. That the neophyte should partake of this food is, according to Gruppe, the basic idea of all communion services: “der Mensch will das göttliche Wesen, das natürlich materiell gedacht, durch die Natur zerstreut ist, in sich aufnehmen.”²

The sacred procession also brought the initiate into relationship with the deity—but through the avenue of sight. This was the act whereby the hierophant revealed to him the sacred objects. Apparently they were taken out of the *μέγαρον*, into which the hierophant alone could enter, and, their covers being removed, they appeared to the *mystae* in brilliant illumination. What they were is not known, yet it seems probable that among them were legendary relics, “such,” says Farnell, “as would cause a religious tremor in the spectator.”

A point of great interest here, though likely to remain obscure, unless further discoveries shed light, is the mention in an Eleusinian expense account of the year 410 B. C., of the use of an *ἄκατος* or skiff. How it was used the inscription does not explain.³ Foucart, to whom the Eleusinia seem Egyptian in character—though this view is not generally shared,—compared the reference to a Greek inscription of the Empire, consecrated to the society of the Gallipoli. Here we have a distinct account of a mystic fishing-ceremony; the persons who take part being an archanon or chief

¹ The *κίστη* probably contained a fetish dangerous to look upon; for this and the *κέπρος*—another ritualistic vessel—see *Hdb.*, 1171, note.

² *Hdb.*, 729.

³ Foucart, *Recherches*, 36–38; also *Bull. de corresp. hellénique*, 1877, p. 410.

of the society, two pilots, a person to throw the nets, several to draw them in, etc., in short the *personnel* for such a rite. It must be said, too, that the cult of Dionysos,¹ whose particular rites were celebrated at Limnae in the so-called Anthesteria, had early taken root at Eleusis and been in part confounded with that of Demeter, so that Dionysos was at times considered the Eleusinian Pluto.² Dionysos's connection with the water is unquestioned, and his name is often associated with a ship. In this respect, as well as others, he is akin to Osiris.

If now we turn to the Egyptian mysteries, in which the doctrine of a future life is prominently developed, we find as a central feature the search for Osiris by his wife and sister (double) Isis.³ Herodotus (II, 171) and others testify that this search was simulated in a skiff on the sacred lake or Nilaeum of the Egyptian temple. The *De Iside et Osiride* of Plutarch affirms that the ceremony was an imitation of the wanderings and misfortunes of the goddess in search of her dismembered spouse: in the end she recovers the fourteen pieces into which he has been torn, and her sorrow turns to joy; for Osiris lives again. To the Egyptian the ship was naturally the vehicle of the dead; so it was also to the Greek, and its presence at Eleusis is no reason for wonder. What is interesting is the use it was put to in the Egyptian ritual, where the simulator of the god, the priest of Isis, the guide to the otherworld, had the chief part. I believe his western counterpart is our Fisher King.

Before drawing this inference, however, it is necessary to consider somewhat in detail the testimony of the other Mediterranean cults. The complex question of their possi-

¹ See, especially, Foucart, *Le Culte de Dionysos, passim*; *Hdb.*, 1420-21; Roscher, *Lexikon*, III, col. 1171.

² Farnell, III, 153.

³ Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 162 ff.

ble interrelation does not concern us. It suffices to note certain distinctive traits in them. The kinship, in Babylonian myth, of Adapa the Wise with the water—as pointed out by Staerk—was mentioned above. Adonis, meaning ‘lord’ (cf. Attis = ‘father,’ like the Eleusinian Poseidon), is really an appellative for Tammuz,¹ and the latter name is thought to be derived from a Sumerian phrase meaning “true son of the deep water.” His name occurs first in Babylonian literature as the spouse of the great mother goddess Ishtar, and, though the records are obscure, it appears that he was believed to be annually borne to the realm of the dead, whither his divine mistress followed him. During their absence reproduction ceases on earth and is not resumed until a messenger of Ea is sent to bring them back. The rites of Tammuz were celebrated just before the summer solstice. Dirges were then chanted over an effigy of the slain god, which was washed with pure water, anointed with oil, and clad in a red robe, “while fumes of incense rose into the air, as if to stir his dormant senses by their pungent fragrance and wake him from the sleep of death.” In this, as in the allied cults of Osiris and Dionysos, the symbolism of the water as a fructifier is evident. “So far,” says Frazer,² “as the Semite personified the reproductive energies of nature as male and female he appears to have identified the male power with water and the female especially with the earth.” A further illustration of the same idea appears in the disruption of the god’s body and the dispersal of the members in the sea, whence the head alone survives and becomes the focus of a new life—a trait common to the Adonis, Osiris,

¹ Frazer, *op. cit.*, 6 ff.

Also Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, Leipzig, 1903, p. 135: “Helios, der Erstling der Geweihten, auch ein *πατήρ*.”

² Frazer, *ibid.*, p. 14.

Orpheus, and Dionysos myths, and to a degree characteristic of them.¹

Thus the significance of the fishing ceremony can no longer be doubted. It symbolizes the recovery of the life-principle from the water, and as a piece of sympathetic magic doubtless had its practical value. For this reason the music of Orpheus attracts the fish, since the inhabitant of the deep is the zoöomorphic symbol of life: thus he comes in Christian lore to be the symbol of the life eternal. The last fact has been interestingly brought out in the work of Robert Eisler on the *Origins of the Eucharist*.² "The underlying truism," he says, "is that Adonis was considered a fish-god, ἰχθύς, son of Derketo . . . , throughout Syria and Palestine. Accordingly, the well-known funeral rites of the Adonis-cult justify St. Jerome's popular etymology explaining the Palestinian fish-god Dag-on as *piscis tristitiae*." Moreover, Arabian reports, already analyzed by Chwolsen, Liebrecht, and Frazer, prove that Tammuz (according to St. Jerome "the great fish") . . . "was an old corn-god, and his passion identical with or at least equivalent to the reaping, threshing, grinding and finally the baking of the corn. The final act of worship seems to have been a sacrificial eating of a cake, formed, as in countless analogies of modern and ancient folk-lore, in the shape of the fish-god himself."³

Akin to the common idea of the death and rebirth of vegetation is the obvious fact of the increase and decrease in the sun's light and heat. It is surely questionable whether the

¹ Roscher, *Lexikon*, III, col. 1171: "Der Mythos von Orpheus' Tod und von seinem schwimmenden, nicht verwesenden Haupt ist daher eine sehr alte Nachbildung des byblischen Adonis-Osirismythos. Derselbe Mythos wurde auch auf Dionysos übertragen: auch der Gott wird zerrissen—wahrscheinlich in 14 Teile, wie Osiris—auch das Haupt des Dionysos ist auf Lesbos angeschwommen."

² See above.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

vegetation myths in question are fundamentally solar. But it would be equally hazardous to deny all solar symbolism to them: light and heat are too plainly creative forces. The Mithra mysteries, of which Cumont has made such a masterful study,¹ are avowedly a light-cult: the reborn soul mounts through the stars to the source of all light; light is the organizing factor in nature, it brings the elements together, their disruption is synonymous with death. The widespread doctrine of the Rebirth comes to include the solar idea.² But it is to be expected that more emphasis would be laid in the north³ upon the sun's regenerative power than in Egypt and her Mediterranean neighbors, where water is the prime necessity. Thus, despite the testimony of writers like Diodorus and Macrobius, we may agree with Hepding and Frazer in denying to Osiris and Attis, and their agrarian congeners, any immediate connection with the sun.⁴ This connection, rather, is late and due to "der synkretischen Sonnenverehrung des ausgehenden Heidenthums."⁵ So,

¹ Cf. *St. John*, VI, 11-13, and XXI, 1-15, where Christ appears to the disciples by the sea-shore: "And he said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast, therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes."

See, in the same gospel, the colloquy of Jesus and Nicodemus, ch. III, 5—"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of *water* and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Cf. Dieterich, *op. cit.*, 175 ff.

² A. Nutt and K. Meyer: *Voyage of Bran*, II (*Celtic Doctrine of the Rebirth*), London, 1897; E. S. Hartland, *Legend of Perseus*, London, 1894, vol. I, esp. ch. II. To the stories there mentioned of the 'King of the Fishes type,' should be added the episode of Raphael and the fish in the Book of Tobit; see Rosenmann, *Studien zum Buche Tobias*, 1894.

³ Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures*, London, 1898, pp. 208-209. The Welsh gorsedd must be held "face to face with the sun and the eye of light, as there is no power to hold a gorsedd under cover or at night, but only where and as long as the sun is visible in the heavens." See, also, Lewis F. Mott, *Round Table* in *M. L. Publ.*, xx (1905), 231 ff.

⁴ Hepding, *op. cit.*, ch. VI; Frazer, *Adonis*, bk. 3, ch. VII.

⁵ Hepding, *l. c.*

too, "le rapport qui existe entre Mithra et le Soleil est celui qui existe entre la lumière et l'astre qui en est la manifestation la plus éclatante."¹ Nevertheless, in all these cases when the particular myth was generalized from a local cult to one of almost universal importance, the analogy to the great luminary lay close at hand and, once suggested, was quickly carried out. Thus we see that Adonis, wounded by a wild boar, in the myth leaves Aphrodite to pass the winter months with Persephone, while in the cult he is carried in as a corpse on a bier, and later he is gathered up in a new shape from the sea—the first act being accompanied with lamentations, the second with rejoicing.² In the Egyptian mysteries Osiris,³ afterwards identified with the sun-god Ra, was represented as dead, dismembered, and resurrected. Herodotus describes the annual celebration of his passion at Sais: it then happened that "Isis in the image of a cow, made of gilt wood with a golden sun between its horns," went forth from her chamber to search for her spouse. In Plutarch's time a similar ceremony was observed about the winter solstice.⁴ An inscription at Philae reads, "this is the form of him whom no one may name, Osiris of the mysteries, who springs from the returning waters." In like manner during the Anthesteria Dionysos leaves his temple to wed the Queen; it was then that he was considered to live. And, finally, in the Dendrophoria, a tree⁵ sacred to Attis was shrouded like a corpse and burned while the bystanders lamented, whereupon the Great Mother searched for him and was joined to him anew; in Rome this was the kernel of the Attis-Cybele cult, which had been established there as

¹ Cumont, *Textes et Monuments*, 225, n. 1.

² Frazer, *Adonis*, bk. 1, ch. I; Foucart, *Culte de Dionysos*, 143 ff.; Gruppe, *Hdb.*, 1530.

³ Frazer, *Adonis*, bk. 3, ch. IV.

⁴ *De Iside*, 52; Frazer, *Adonis*, 261.

⁵ Hepding, *Attis*, 220, and *passim* for influence on Christianity.

early as 204 B. C., and which was thence carried westward and northward. In all of these cases, the special concept was absorbed toward the end of the pagan period into the belief of a supreme, universal sun-god.

III.

We see from the above discussion that Simrock's early suggestion furnishes the most plausible explanation of the Grail question. What remains of the Grail romances when stripped of the Perceval-Galaad quest is clearly a vegetation ceremony. In this the central figure is the Fisher King, the medium of comparison, the *tertium quid* whereby the ancient and the mediæval records can be compared. It is hardly necessary to repeat here the agreements upon which the argument rests; for the most part they are self-evident. It is far more important to show how the Grail story thus viewed acquires purpose and to a certain degree consistency.

The Holy Grail, by the mediæval romancers often conceived in terms of a quest, is *au fond* an initiation, the purpose of which is to ensure the life of the vegetation spirit, always in danger of extinction, and to admit the "qualified" mortal into its mystery (Joseph, v. 935: *la sunt li grant secré escrit*). I do not believe we can go far wrong in insisting on both its agrarian and its mystic features. For though both may not be present to the same degree in the romances in which the ceremony has been handed down, it is at present difficult to state where the one feature ceases and the other begins. Like the Eleusinia, the Grail rites may have been agrarian¹ and mystic from the start. At all events, no positive distinction is to be made.

¹See Mott, *op. cit.*, for the "round table" as an agricultural rite; also W. Hertz, *op. cit.*, 461, on the festival known as a 'graal.' As Mott says, p. 256, Arthur's refraining from eating until he has heard of some adventure, "is possibly connected with primitive rites."

On this basis, then, the Grail theme contains three essential figures and three important symbols. They are :—

I. The Fisher King, an intermediary between the two planes of existence,¹ the present and the hereafter ; himself the symbol of the creative, fructifying force in nature, specifically associated with water or 'moisture.' The representative of the otherworld, he is also the guide to it, perhaps as Nutt has suggested, the Dis or Pluto of the Celtic Hades.² Hence he is described as fishing on the water,³ as directing

¹ Miss Weston has kindly called my attention to the description of the Grail found in the *Prose Lancelot*: "for 'twas not of wood, nor of any manner of metal, nor was it in any wise of stone, nor of horn, nor of bone" (*Arth. romances not in Malory*, VI, London, 1903). In *Syr Gawayne and the Grene Knyghte* Gawain carries the invincible sign, the pentangle ; and the *Espee` as estranges rences* in Q. bears the inscription, *memoire de sens*, which in the Dutch version reads: *Gedankennisse van Sinne*. This all points to a mystical, almost theosophic, interpretation, which might lead to Cornelius Agrippa's (fifteenth century) idea of the three planes of existence with their respective colors. For modern parallels, see *L'Initiation*, *Revue philosophique*, vol. 73, 1903. Cf. also Andrew Lang's essay in Kirk's *Secret Commonwealth* of 1691, republished by D. Nutt, London, 1893. The question of the influence of the mediæval 'magic' might be profitably investigated, if cautiously approached ; for no boundary can be set to allegorizing. At the same time we must assume that the Grail-cult was primarily a blood-ritual which had a very definite and rather palpable meaning, and therefore it seems reasonable that the inscription *memoire de sens* was a summons to remember the blood and not to fall asleep as Gawain does in the *Perlesvaus* (Pot., I, 89). This particular question is, I believe, to be treated in Miss Weston's forthcoming volume, to which I refer the reader.

² In his recent (1908) *Habilitationschrift* at Zurich, Pestalozzi considers the Lohengrin-legend from a similar point of view. From a *compte-rendu* of it I gather that he deems Lohengrin a kind of water-spirit to whom the swan is sacred.

³ Heinzl, *Gralromane*, 71, has observed the effect, in Wauchier, of the Grail visit on the streams and rivers (v. 20340 ff.) :

Onques teus ne fu esgardée
Tièrre ki si bien fust garnie
D'aigue, de bos, de prairie :

the Arthurian knight to the Grail castle, as officiating as Perceval's host, as presiding at the Grail repast, as being the person of whom the question must be asked, as being succeeded by the Grail knight. And his weakness or infirmity agrees with Nature's declining strength ; thus his land lies waste or is under the ban of enchantment.

This conception of the character, as the focus of a ritual, is, I believe, organic in the Grail romances. As with the mysteries, however, we shall be forced to distinguish the ritual from the mythic side of the character. And the myth of the Fisher King in Celtic territory alone will require a separate study. Here I can refer in the briefest manner only to the scattered contributions made by Nutt, Rhys, J. Loth, and others. It is reasonably certain that one of his earliest Celtic forms is Manannán mac Lir,¹ the great shape-

C'estoit li roiaumes destruis.
N'estoit pas plus que mienuis,
Le soir devant, que Dex avoit
Rendu issi com il devoit
As aiges lor cors el país ;
Et tout li bos, ce m'est avis
Refurent en verdor trové.

Cf. 'Elucidation' also.

¹On shape-shifting in Wales and Ireland, see Rhys, *Celtic Folklore*, Oxford, 1901, vol. II, ch. XI. Another son of Lir ('ler' = sea) is Bran, concerning whom see below, p. 404. Rhys, *op. cit.*, 549, says: "it is to be borne in mind that the Lir-Llyr group [in the *Mabinogion*] is strikingly elemental in its patronymic Lir, Llyr. The nominative . . . was *ler*, 'sea,' and so Cormac renders Mac Lir by *filius maris*." See also Loth, *op. cit.*, I, 97, and Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 216.

Nicholson, *Keltic Researches*, London, 1904, pp. 12 ff., connects the name Manannán with "Menapii" = 'Watermen'; cf. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, II, 165. The *Yellow Book of Lecan* says of Mac Lir: "a celebrated merchant . . . between Erin, and Alban, and Manann, and a Druid . . . , and . . . the best navigator that was frequenting Erin . . . *Et ideo Scoti et Britones eum dominum maris vocaverunt et inde filium maris*"—cf. above.

Manannán's son Mongan (K. Meyer and A. Nutt, *Voyage of Bran*, I, 42—

shifter of the Irish, the Manawyddan ab Llyr of Welsh romance. Manannán is clearly an otherworld being, who lures to his realm the Irish hero Cúchulinn. This story is told in the *Serglige Conculaind*,¹ which Brown adduces as the earliest type of the *Yvain* story, and which Rhys connects with the *Peredur*.² Whatever these relationships may be, in Wales we do find the character closely connected with Pwyll, whose French counterpart is Pelles³ (in *Perl.* he is still the 'King of the Low Folk'), originally the Fisher King's brother, then the Fisher King himself (Q., GS.). With Pwyll, Manawyddan dwells in *Caer Sidi* or *Caer Pedryvan*, i. e., the Four-cornered Castle (cf. *Perl.*, 328 : *Il aprochent le chastel et virent IIII areines sonner aux IIII chief de la vile*), and there the Cauldron of Hades is kept.⁴

In several minor⁵ matters Manannán suggests the Fisher King : he has a mantle of invisibility ; he supplies ale which preserves from death and old age ; his land suffers from enchantments⁶ ; his sword leaves "no relic of stroke or blow behind." Essentially the same character occurs under other names and with varying attributes, though the fundamental concept seems to be constant. Thus we find Gwyno Garanhir⁷ (according to Rhys,⁸ 'Long-crane') famous

90) also is known for his power of shifting his shape as well as that of others. The sea-king Mangon in *Diu Crône* may be a "distortion" of Mongan, cf. Lucy A. Paton, *Fairy Myth. of Arth. Romance*, 113 ; the romancers, she thinks, confused his name with that of Morgain the *fée*.

¹ From the *Lebor Na H-Uidre*, Windisch, *Irische Texte*, I, 119-227.

² A. C. L. Brown, *Iwain*, 34 ff. ; Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 218.

³ *My Glastonbury and the Holy Grail* in *Mod. Phil.*, I, 254.

⁴ Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 300 ff., 259, where he classifies together Pwyll, Bran, Urien, Uther Ben (the Urban of D.), Pellam, etc.

⁵ A summary can be found in A. C. L. Brown, *Iwain*, 42, note ; also O'Curry, *On the manners, etc.*, II, 198.

⁶ See Loth, *Mabinogion*, I, 101 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 244, note.

⁸ *Arth. Leg.*, 316.

in Welsh both for the fish he catches and the *mwys* or basket which can supply the whole world with food: every first of May eve, fish to the value of a hundred pounds were caught in his weir.¹ Rhys had already identified him with the Fisher King, with reference partly to the curious dialogue in the *Black Book of Carmarthen* between him and *Gwyn*,² which latter name may be reflected in Manessier's *Goon* and Crestien's *Gonemans*. Thus, as *Gwyn* and *Finn* appear to be parallel forms,³ the story of Finn and the Salmon of Wisdom mentioned above most likely pertains to the same group of ideas.⁴

II. The Grail Knight—Perceval, Bors, Galaad, Gawain—is the initiate. As such he must qualify specially and is responsible for the success of the Grail service, since if he fails the crops fail and “the springs run dry” (E.). Having succeeded, he is not only *ἐπόπτης* in the sense that he beholds the vision (sin, for example, prevents Lancelot in Perl. from seeing the Grail), but he shares in the secrets of the Grail, and becomes the Fisher King's successor.⁵

III. The Fisher-King's father or “double.” He stands for the life-god himself.⁶ Therefore, some versions represent

¹ Rhys, *Celtic Folklore*, 387.

² Loth, *op. cit.*, I, 244.

³ Above, note 2, p. 367. In Perl. there is a *roi de la gaie*.

⁴ See Nutt, *Studies*, ch. VII.

⁵ The blood relationship is not clear. The Grail Knight probably originally descends in the female line; see Rhys, *Celtic Folklore*, 682—the son of the sister among the Picts. The idea of sonship may have arisen, too, from the fact that the Fisher King was probably like Poseidon, Attis, Helios, etc., a *πατήρ*, though not in a physical sense; cf. A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, Leipzig, 1903, p. 135. Thus finally the Grail Knight becomes the Fisher King's lineal grandson, as for instance, Galaad.

⁶ Martin, *Parzival*, Introd., p. lviii, states that “ueberzeugend hat ihn Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 367, wiedergefunden” in the Cronus legend related by Plutarch as current among the Britons. Martin refers to the Fisher King,

him, like Osiris, Adonis, Dionysos, as dead upon a bier with a broken sword by his side (Wa., E.). Probably more primitive is the concept that he lies in a room (the *autre chambre* of C.), which the Fisher King alone can enter, or in a sumptuous palace or island (*Huth-Merlin*¹ and Perl.), where the Grail hero finds him. I take it that it was he originally who was wounded by the lance or sword, in the vital (generative) part like Adonis (Osiris), and that he was not so much to be avenged as to be healed. Him the Grail serves with its miraculous food²; to him the mystic question, *cui on en sert*, doubtless refers. In Q., especially, he is called the "Lame King," though this name is more suitably

though the similarity is rather with the father or 'double' in the room, island, or sumptuous palace. Cronus is, of course, the Gr. *κρόνος*, not only in name, see Plutarch, but also in attribute, cf. Roscher, *Lexikon*, col. 1481 ff., and O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie*, pp. 392, 395. Roscher maintains that the story is "zum grössten Teile alles andere als keltisch u. gehört durchaus in die klassische Mythologie" but is compelled to admit Northern elements, in it. The idea of the "slumbering god" is widespread; cf. Merlin, Barbarossa, Endymion, Arthur (even in Sicily), Ogier, etc. But the version of Plutarch cannot be explained on that basis alone; making all due allowance for syncretism with Greek concepts, it must have had a basis in local Celtic beliefs: people who reach the island where Cronus is imprisoned and watched over by Briareus must serve him for 13 years; the island is so fine a place that then they prefer to remain; Cronus himself lies in a cave between crags, buried in slumber, and waited on by deities, formerly his companions, now his servants. According to Pliny, *Nat. His.*, 4; 94, 104, the Arctic Ocean was called *κρόνιον πέλαγος*, perhaps after the planet Saturn. Cf. Rhys, *Hib. Lect.*, *passim*.

On the idea of the "double," cf. A. Lang, *op. cit.*, p. xxv.

¹ II, 27: here he is Joseph of Arimathea, possibly too in Perl., as Heinzel suggests, though there he may be Evalach (Avalloc), since no name is given. Cf. above.

² *Conte del Graal*, vv. 7796-7800:

D'une sole oïste li sains hom
Quant en ce Gréal li aporte,
Sa vie sostient et conforte,
Tant sainte cose est li Graaus.

given his son or brother, the Fisher King; but I see no reason for supposing that the latter had it originally.

IV. The Grail—in some instances, the *Rich Grail*¹—paralleled in the mysteries by the *κίστη* or Holy Box, is the receptacle for the divine food (wafer or blood) by partaking of which the mortal establishes a blood-bond with the god. Thus it comes naturally to possess talismanic properties, primarily providing food, but also preserving from disease and decay, distinguishing the faithful from the sinners, and even ensuring victory in battle.² This leads by easy stages to its identification in the twelfth century, through the medium of a holy blood legend, with the relic of Calvary, and thence with the cup of the Last Supper. The avenue of transmission may have been a monastery, possibly Glastonbury or Fécamp. The special importance of Glastonbury I hope to point out in my edition of the *Perlesvaus*. Here, however, I desire to call attention to an interesting point in connection with Fécamp.

Fécamp, according to legend, owes its name to a fig-tree³: “Fescamp pour le figuier nommé.” The story

¹ In ms. B. N. f. 12,576 (the best Gerbert ms. according to Jessie L. Weston, *Arth. Rom. Unrepres. in Malory*, vi, 1903, p. 76).

² Heinzl, *Gralromane*, 178–179.

³ Jessie L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, i, London, 1906, pp. 157 ff. Another account not cited by Miss Weston is found in *Gallia Christiana*, xi, 204: “Eo in sanctuario asservant religiosissime et venerantur monachi pretiosum, ut aiunt, sanguinem, id est ex majorum traditione aliquantum terrae aut pulveris, ipso Jesu Christi sanguine pateretur respersi. Terra illa plumbeos tubos duos essarcit in argenteis duobus aliis tubis inclusos, quos complectitur pixis ex auro inaurata, et ipsa in pulcherrima, seu turri seu conflata ex eodem metallo pyramide comprehensa. Quo tempore, quave ratione, tanto pignore locupletati sint Fiscannenses non produnt monumenta. Docent tamen diu absconditum fuisse; dum vero quo loci depositum esset ignoraretur ab omnibus, repertum esse feliciter XIV Calend. Augusti anno 1170 in muro, seu potius in columna quadam, quam muros undique circumvestiebat. Non desunt qui religiosum pretiosi hujus

runs that after the Crucifixion, Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus remove the blood from Christ's wounds, and that Nicodemus conceals a portion of it in a glove. In course of time this glove is passed on to Nicodemus's heir Isaac. The latter goes to Sidon, and being warned there of the impending destruction of Jerusalem, he conceals the relic in the trunk of a fig-tree, together with another relic, presumably the knife with which the blood had been removed. Finding that the country is no longer safe, Isaac cuts down the tree and commits the trunk with the two relics, now encased in leaden tubes, to the sea. The trunk is washed ashore at Fécamp, where after sending forth "three saplings," it is found by the children of a certain Bos, and afterwards transported by an angel disguised as a pilgrim to the spot where the abbey stands. Later, during Lothaire's reign, the history of the relics is made known to St. Wanninge in a trance.¹ In this way Fécamp comes, during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, to have strong claims to the possession of the Holy Blood—claims which the Norman kings, especially Henry II, tended to exploit. Certain of the Perceval mss. even, in the section relating to Mont Dolorous, cite as their authority,

"le conte qui a Fescans
est toz escria,"

though we need not go so far as Miss Weston, to whom this discovery is due, and regard that testimony as necessarily trustworthy.

sanguinis cultum elevare conati sunt; sed sacrae theologorum Parisiensium facultatis decreto satis confutati sunt v. Cal. Junii anno 1448, in hunc modum: *Non repugnat*, inquiunt illi, *pietati fidelium credere, quod aliquid de sanguine Christi effuso tempore Passionis, remanserit in terris*, ut refert Argentreus Collect. Judicior. de novis errorib. tom. i, p. 250." This passage was known to Heinzl, *Grailromane*, 40.

¹ Leroux de Linsey: *Essai sur l'abbaye de Fescamp*, Rouen, 1840; Gourdon de Genouillac, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Fécamp*, 1875.

Now the tree containing the blood of the slain god is an important feature in the rites of the Mediterranean vegetation-deity. Frazer¹ says: "The character of Osiris as a tree-spirit was represented very graphically in a ceremony described by Firmicus Maternus. A pine-tree having been cut down, the center was hollowed out, and with the wood thus excavated an image of Osiris was made, which was then buried like a corpse in the hollow of the tree." Or, according to the myth of Osiris,² a "coffer containing the body of Osiris had floated down the river and away out to sea, till at last it drifted ashore at Byblus, on the coast of Syria. Here a fine *erica*-tree shot up suddenly and enclosed the chest in its trunk. The king of the country, admiring the growth of the tree, had it cut down and made into a pillar of his house. Word of this came to Isis and she journeyed to Byblus and sat down by the well, in humble guise, her face wet with tears." Finally, "in the likeness of a swallow [she] fluttered round the pillar that contained her dead brother, twittering mournfully." In the rites of Attis a pine-tree was cut down, swathed like a corpse and decked with violets, then an effigy, doubtless of the god himself, was tied to the stem. In the ensuing ceremony the clergy "gashed their bodies with potsherds or slashed them with knives in order to bespatter the altar and the sacred tree with their flowing blood."³

These citations are sufficient to show that in the Fécamp story we are face to face with an almost identical vegetation myth. The sacred tree, the blood ceremony, the knives, the recovery from the sea, the sprouting of the tree, and the

¹*Adonis*, 276 ; Plumptre, *Narrative of a Three Years' Residence in France*, London, 180, III, 187, mentions a Breton tale in which Merlin's mistress encloses him in a tree (see Rhys, *Hib. Lect.*, 157-8).

²Frazer, *Adonis*, 214.

³*Adonis*, 167 ; Hepding, *Attis*, 158 ff.

concealment of the dead god in it are all in the Fécamp story. That the tree itself should be a fig-tree does not affect the argument. The fig-tree was sacred also at Eleusis; and especially in Rome,¹ where the feast celebrating the death of Romulus took place under the wild fig—the *caprificus*, as the Romans called it. Lack of space prevents my treating the question here fully. Besides, I prefer to leave it in abeyance. It should be noted, however, that from the discovery of a Gallo-Roman cemetery near Fécamp it is not precluded that Fécamp was open to such eastern cults as Roman civilization carried with it into the north. The Cybele-Attis cult was one of these; and the mention of the Phoenician Sidon in the Fécamp story is certainly curious. Without examining further the question of the fish-goddess Derketō or the fish-god Dagon (see above), it will be sufficient to note that *Sidon* is the diminutive of *Sid*, which means 'fisher,' the eponymous god of the place Sidon.² "His Sumerian name," says Eisler,³ "Zag-ḥa, has been singled out by Thureau-Dangin in the Gudea inscriptions, the earliest records of civilized mankind." Furthermore, the special Nicodemus⁴ episode that is found embedded in the Wauchier account of the *Gawain-Grail* visit—in which Nicodemus commits to the sea a crucifix which he had carved "after life"—suggests the images of their deities which the Egyptians carved out of the sycamore wood, the sycamore like the tamarisk being sacred to Osiris. Finally,

¹ Frazer, *Kingship*, 270.

² See C. P. LaGrange: *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, Paris, 1903, pp. 130, 374.

³ *Op. cit.*, 2; Frazer, *Adonis*, 13.

⁴ Heinzel, *Gralromane*, 45, with list of references on the episode; for text, see Jessie L. Weston, *Sir Perceval*, I, 162. Cf. E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, Leipzig, 1899, and Foerster, *Sainte Vou de Luques* in the "Mélanges Chabaneau," on which see Schultz-Gora: *Zeit. rom. Phil.*, XXXII, (1908), 458-59.

in Perl.,¹ in the hall in which the Fisher King receives the Grail knight, there is a *pilier de coivre sur quoi un aigle seoit qui tenoit une croiz dor où il avoit de la veraie croiz à Dieu fu mis, autretant comme la croiz auoit de grant, que li preudons aouroit.*²

V. The Lance, known rarely as the lance of Longinus,³ is the weapon with which the deity's strength has been impaired. It is the instrument of sacrifice. This is still its characteristic in W. Thus, too, it is represented as dripping blood, like the sword of John the Baptist in Perl., which bleeds at noontide, and the sword whereby Joseph of Arimathea is injured in GS.⁴

In the Mabinogi of 'Math, son of Mathonwy,' a lance is the weapon whereby Llew (= Ir. Lug, Gaul. Lugus) is slain, as he stands with one foot on the back of a he-goat (evidently Capricornus), and the other beside a pail of water (Aquarius)—a clear instance of nature symbolism.⁵ By a lance, too,—a poisoned one—Bran is wounded in 'Branwen, daughter of Llyr,'—Bran⁶ the brother of Manawyddan,

¹ Potvin, *Perceval li Gallois*, I, 1866, p. 86. The Oxford text (Hatton, 82) has substantially the same reading.

² Cf. Mussafia: *Ueber die Legende v. d. heil. Kreuz*, in *Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad.*, LXIII, 182, 189.

³ On the lance of Longinus see Heinzel, *Grailromane*, 9; also Bugge-Schofield, *Home of the Eddic Poems*, London, 1899, xxxviii; and Burdach, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, xxiv, 352.

⁴ Hucher, III, 217. With the lance should also be compared the venomous spear of Pezar, king of Persia, whose name is 'Slaughterer'; cf. "The Fate of the Children of Turenn" in Joyce, *Old Celtic Romances*, 59.

⁵ J. Loth, *op. cit.*, I, 117 ff. On the structure of the Mabinogion see the interesting articles of E. Anwyl: *The Four Branches of the Mabinogion*, beginning in vol. I of *Zeit. für Celt. Phil.* Math, according to Loth, 117, again occurs in the names Mathonwy, Matholwch, as a Plutonic character; cf. Rhys, *Lectures on Welsh Phonology*, 2nd ed., 413, 414.

⁶ Bran = "raven" (cf. Holder, *brāno-s*). See the material in Loth, *op. cit.*, I, 65–66, 83 and 94, and in Rhys, *Celtic Folklore*, II, 552–553, where

the guardian of the cauldron of regeneration. Rhys sees in him "one of the principal names of the Celtic Dis." But, like his brother, he is essentially a water-god, and Goidelic in origin. He wades through the sea with "musicians on his back," he spans rivers so that armies pass over him, and after he is decapitated his head keeps his companions company, preventing them from growing old, until they bury it in the white hill of London. A number of saints in Welsh hagiology are connected with him.¹ In the Llangollen district his name appears in place-names; for instance, Castell Dinas Bran, lake Llyn Bran and Dinbran.² Presumably he is the Barintus³ of the *Vita Merlini*, and the Brennus⁴ of Geoffrey's *Historia Regum Britanniae*. The name Danbran,⁵ given Perceval's sister in Perl., is perhaps a link. Is it not, therefore, clear, that he survives, as Nutt affirmed, in Brons the Fisher? In other words, that he is in Welsh (or Breton) myth what our Fisher King is in the Grail rites; primarily the dark deity of the waters, who is friendly to man? Like Mimir in Norse myth,⁶ the master of the *Binnengewässer*, the fertilizing power inherent in pond and pool, whose wisdom all creatures acknowledge?⁷

he is compared to Cernunnos, mainly because of his size. Also Nutt and Kuno Meyer: *Voyage of Bran, son of Febal*, London, 1895; Zimmer, *Brendan's Meerfahrt in Zeit. deut. Alterth.*, xxxiii (1889).

¹ Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 77; *Iolo MSS.*, 100, 8, 40; *Zeit. Celt. Phil.*, i, 287. See also Whitley Stokes, *Zeit. Celt. Phil.*, i, 63:

"Brénainn (of Clonfert) loved intense devotion, according to synod and assembly. Seven years on the back of the whale, the arrangement of devotion was a hardship." See Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 181, 303, ff; also A. Schulze, *Zur Brendanlegende in Zeit. rom. Phil.*, xxx, 276 ff. Brendan's association with the whale is, I believe, more direct than Schulze admits.

² Anwyl, *Zeit. Celt. Phil.*, iii, 132.

³ A. C. L. Brown, *Revue Celtique*, xxii, 339-344.

⁴ Anwyl, *Zeit. Celt. Phil.*, i, 287.

⁵ Potvin, i. In *Mod. Phil.*, i, 250, I sided with Heinzel, *Gralromane*, 94, wrongly, I now believe.

⁶ W. Golther, *Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie*, Leipzig, 1895, p. 179.

⁷ The Black Fisherman in Campbell, see above, p. 367, n. 1.

So the independence of the lance from the Grail, noticed by several scholars,¹ has much in its favor. Sacramentally they are opposites: the one impairs life, the other sustains it. Yet as a part of the ritual the lance is of prime importance, since it impairs life only in order to sustain it elsewhere, the process being imitative or rather 'sympathetic' of what occurs in Nature. Thus the sacrifice is vicarious. Hence it becomes technically possible, as in P., to have a Grail romance in which the Grail is replaced by an equivalent; namely, the head on the salver.²

VI. The Sword, which in at least three versions (C., W., G.) Perceval receives as a gift from the Fisher King, and which is then broken and remade, is a symbol similar to the sword of Manannán, foster-father of the Irish light-god Lug, and the mythic counterpart of our Fisher King. In general, it is thus identical with the well known Celtic Sword of Light, the quest of which figures in the Irish version of the Werewolf story, in connection with which it has been discussed by Professor Kittredge.³ To this discussion I can add nothing, except to repeat that in the Irish *märchen* of *Morraha*⁴ the Sword of Light is in the possession of the Rough Niall of the Speckled Rock, whereas in the tale of *Art and Balor Beimenach* its owner is King Under the Wave.

The original account of the Grail⁵ sword has been much

¹ In G(erbart) the country folk rejoice because Perceval has asked after the lance, thus restoring the fruitfulness of the land; see Weston, *Sir Perceval*, pp. 140 ff.

² Loth, II, 60.

³ *Arthur and Gorlagon* in *Harv. Studies and Notes*, VIII, Boston, 1903, pp. 213 ff. On marvelous swords in Celtic material, see also Lucy A. Paton, *Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance*, Boston, 1903, pp. 199 ff., notes.

⁴ William Larminie, *West Irish Folk-Tales and Romances*, London, 1893, p. 15.

⁵ Jeremiah Curtin, *Hero Tales of Ireland*, London, 1894, p. 325. In the tale of *Coldfeet and the Queen of the Lonesome Island*, *ibid.*, 246, "the

obscured by the romancers, deliberately, it seems, by Wolfram,¹ who connects it, however, with the question concerning the Grail²:

dô was er vragens mit ermant.

Yet the following characteristics of it are clear³:—

It is made by a smith called Trebuchet; cf. O. F. *trébuchet*, an engine of war.⁴

He has made three weapons of the type.

It will stand but one blow, a second one breaks it—and in fact it does break against the gate of Paradise.

Thereupon it is mended in a lake, beneath a rock before daybreak; and the smith, who has mended it, at once dies.

sword of light that never fails, the loaf of bread that is never eaten, and the bottle of water that is never drained” are the property of the Queen of the Lonesome Island.

¹ *Parzival*, 434, 25 has the following verses, which evidently represent a condensation:

Sîn swert, daz im Anfortas
gap dô er bîme grale was,
brast sît dô er bestanden wart:
dô machtez ganz des brunnen art
bî Karnant, der dâ heizet Lac
das swert gehalf im prîss bejac.

² *Parz.*, 240, 6.

³ Crestien, vv. 4314–21, 4332–35, 4345–46, 4836 ff.; for variant readings, see Miss Weston, *Sir Perceval*, 134; Manessier, vv. 41495–41582 (here the smith is called Tribuet); Gerbert in ms. B. N. f. 12,576 fo. 54^{vo} or Potvin, *Perceval li Gallois*, vi, 168–169; cf. Miss Weston, *ibid.*, 140 ff. The passages in Wolfram are *Parzival*, 239, 19 ff.; 240, 6; 253, 24 ff.; 434, 25 ff. On Miss Weston’s arguments, see E. Brugger in *Zeit. franz. Spr. u. Lit.*, xxxi, review section, 122–162; I do not, however, agree that Garlon “dürfte mit Wieland identisch sein;” see below. Further material on the Grail Sword I hope to publish elsewhere.

⁴ See Weston, *op. cit.*, 150, where the name is connected with *trebucier* ‘to stumble’ or rather ‘to fall’, with a view to linking it with the lameness of Wayland. Miss Weston, however, herself adds: “this is only thrown out as a suggestion.”

The Sword of Light is of common occurrence in folklore. Arthur's sword, Excalibur,¹ noted for its intense brilliancy, belongs to the same class; so, it appears, does the sword of Heimdall² in Norse mythology, which is called *Høfuð* or 'Head'—and Heimdall, we remember, is the son of nine virgins, whose names designate waves of the sea. The Sword of John the Baptist in *Perl.*,³ for which Gawain undertakes a quest, shows traces of the same type: it has to be recovered from King Gurgalon, whose cannibalistic traits clearly identify him with the Welsh *Gwrgi Garwlwyd*,⁴ whom the Triads hold up to scorn, the Garlan of the *Huth-Merlin*, the Garlon of Malory and the same name as Gorlagon,⁵ equating with the Welsh for "werewolf"; its size varies according to whether it is sheathed or drawn, and as I have shown elsewhere,⁶ it has the same part in the Grail

¹ Cf. J. Loth, *op. cit.*, I (*Rhonabwy's Dream*), 301; "c'était si saisissant qu'il était difficile à qui que ce fût de regarder l'épée."

² W. Golther, *Germ. Myth.*, 362.

³ Potvin, I, 75 ff.; here the sword is as *clère comme une esmeraude et a-tresint vert*; in the hilt is a *seintime pierre* put there by *Enax*, emperor of Rome. Cf. the Lapidary, publ. by Paul Meyer, *Romania*, XXXVIII (1909), 57, 66 and 68.

⁴ Triads, I, 37, III, 45, 46; Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 73, 121.

⁵ Kittredge, *op. cit.*, 205 ff. Brugger, *op. cit.*, 132 says: "An der Richtigkeit von W.'s (Weston's) Hypothese, dass das Schwertmotiv (wenigstens theilweise) nordischen (normannischen) Ursprungs ist . . . kann man kaum zweifeln." That I accept, if the *theilweise* means *by means of later identification* with Germanic myth in French form (cf. Maurus, *Die Wiedlandsage in der Literatur*, Leipzig, 1902). But because Garlon is a magician and is concerned in a tale about a sword that breaks at one blow, this cannot be regarded as showing, as Brugger affirms, that he is originally the same personage as *Galaan* (< Vallandus). On the contrary, his name and his traits show him to be a "dark divinity" like our Fisher King, opposed in the story to Balaaïn or Balyn, Geoffrey's Belinus, the Apollo Belenus of the inscriptions. But he may later have been confused with Galaan, to whose forging Gawain's sword is attributed in the *M. E. Golagros and Gawayne*. For the inscription on Gawain's sword, see Paul Meyer, *Rom.* XXXIV, 98.

⁶ *Grail Romance Perlesvaus*, 55.

“service” (*le service du saintisme Graal*) as the Grail Sword in C.

To the French romancers Gawain is *par excellence* the knight of the sword.¹ Moreover, one of his notable traits is that his strength varies with the hour of the day, which Gaston Paris² interprets as “évidemment en rapport avec le cours du soleil.” The *Espee as estranges renges* which he goes to find in C. (vv. 6090 ff.), at Montesclaire, judging by the last name, might have a similar meaning; that is, it may also be a symbol of light. The *Conte del Graal*,³ however, later identifies it with the sword of Judas Maccabaeus, which, it says, Joseph of Arimathea brought into the land: yet it lies concealed in a vault, the door of which closes itself, and it renders its wearer victorious. In the Dutch *Walewein*⁴ it belongs to King Amores, to whom it ensures victory, and in Q.⁵ and GS.⁶ we find it again, this time as

¹ *Histoire littéraire*, xxx (Gaston Paris), 29 ff.; *Le Chevalier à l'épée*, ed. Armstrong, Baltimore, 1900; Jessie L. Weston, *The Legend of Sir Gawain*, London, 1897. In Pierre Berquière, *Reductorium Morale*, bk. xiv, prologue, Gawain finds by chance a Palace under the Water, where there is a seat prepared for him and a table set with food; but as he starts to eat he sees a dead man's head in the platter, and a giant lying on a bier near the fire rises up and strikes his brow against the roof; the head speaks and forbids him to eat. In connection with this, it should be noted that on the journey to the kingdom of Gorre in Crestien's *Lancelot*, Gawain chooses the first of the *felons passages*, namely, *Li Ponz Evages* (*Charrete*, v. 660). Obviously Gawain has a marked relationship with an under-the-sea kingdom, all of which is in accord with the theory advocated in this paper. Compare the Perseus-like adventure related of him in Perl., 252 ff., and especially in the *De Ortu Waluani*, ed. Bruce, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xv, 326 ff. Peredur's adventure at the Court of the King of Suffering (Loth, *op. cit.*, II, 85) is also deserving of note on this question; the *Avanc* which he slays with the aid of the invisible-making stone, is evidently a water-spirit; see Rhys, *Celtic Folklore*, 430. Cf. E. S. Hartland, *The Legend of Perseus*, London, 1894, vol. I, ch. 1. ²*Hist. litt.*, xxx, 35.

³ Weston, *Sir Perceval*, 225. ⁴*Hist. litt.*, xxx, 83: *met de vreemde ringen*.

⁵ Ed. Furnivall, London, 1861-63, 182 ff.

⁶ Ed. Hucher, II, 446-452; Lonelich, *Seynt Graal*, London, 1861-63, ch. xxviii, v. 202.

the Sword of David in Solomon's ship. Like Excalibur, which has two snakes depicted on it in gold, and the sword of the Helgi Lay¹ with "the blood-stained serpent along the edge" (*liggr með eggju ormr dreyrfáiðr*), its hilt is here made of the bones of two *divierves biestes*: "La première estoit d'une manière de serpent qui convierse en Calidonie plus que en autres tière, si est apielée Papaguities; d'icelui serpent est tex la force qui se nus hom tient nule de ses costes u aucuns de ses autres os, il n'a garde de sentir nule trop grant calour ne par force de soleil ne pour escaufement de travail; ançois est toutes eures en mesureible calour tant com il le tient. D'itel manière et d'itel force est la première coste et l'autre si est un poisson qui n'est mie moult grans et si convierse ens u flun d'Euftrate et non pas en autre ewe. Chil poissons a non Cortenans, et ses costes sunt d'itel force que se uns hom en prent une, jà tant comme il le tenra ne li souvenra des joies ne de deus que il ait eu, fors seulement d'icelui cose pour quoi il l'aura prise; et maintenant que il l'aura jus mise, si repensera autressi com il est acoustumet à manière de nature honme."² When broken by Nascien, the sword is mended by Mordrain. It can be carried only by the *plus preus* and the *plus hardis*. In Q., Perceval's sister supplies it with hangings made with her own hair, and names its scabbard *memoire de sens*, which may or may not have mystical meaning.³

IV.

In conclusion be it said, that the above views are presented mainly as suggestions made on the basis of present

¹ Bugge-Schofield, *op. cit.*, pp. 326-327.

² Hucher, II, 447.

³ Cf. note, p. 395. In P. the hero's training is mainly in the use of the sword, though his epithet is *Paladyr Hir*; that is, "of the long lance." See Loth, *op. cit.*, II, 71.

material. Though the Grail ceremonies and the ancient mysteries have the same *leit-motiv*, there exists no reason for claiming any direct connection between them. While the fundamental concept of the Fisher King is doubtless a Mediterranean cult, it is quite possible that in the Grail romances it descends in direct line from the primitive Celts, the *Urkelten*, in Gaul, Wales and Ireland. As we have seen, the underlying fact is the identification of Life and Fertility with the creative power of moisture—and this idea is well-nigh universal. For example, we find it¹ among the Dakotas in North America, where the institution of the life-giving medicine-bag was in the control of Onktehi, “the great spirit of the waters”; and many other examples could doubtless be cited. It has recently been suggested² that this concept, in another form, lay at the basis of the earliest Greek ideas of the genesis of the universe: “Thales, the Milesian, declared that the first principle of things is water For he says that all things come from water and all are resolved into water.” The particular Gallo-Roman *Dēvona-Diana* cult which I have tried³ to point out in Crestien’s *Yvain* is but another manifestation of the same belief. Into the Druidic beliefs concerning the other life which classic writers have handed down, I have not been able to go. Their Pythagorean coloring is discussed by Nutt⁴ with the net result that the Celts had definite ideas of immortality and rebirth to which the doctrine of Pythagoras bore a resemblance. To this hypothesis our conclusions broadly

¹ G. H. Pond, *Dakota Superstitions*, St. Paul, 1867, pp. 35, 37–40; Frazer, *Golden Bough*², III, 432.

² By G. D. Hadzsits in an article on *Aphrodite and the Dione Myth*, in *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, XXX, 53.

³ *Modern Philology*, III, 267 ff.; VII, no. 3., where I have considerably amplified my former argument, with certain modifications.

⁴ *Voyage of Bran*, II: *The Celtic Doctrine of Rebirth*, II, 113.

conform.¹ The ritualistic nature of Celtic beliefs is attested by such classical writers as Pomponius Mela, Posidonius, Strabo, and others. Of especial interest in this connection is the description Mela gives of the priestesses of Sena,² who are able to "cause the sea and the wind by their incantations, to turn themselves into whatsoever animal form they choose, to cure diseases which among others are incurable." It is admitted that the Celtic rites were agricultural. At the same time the degree to which they were assimilated to non-Celtic cults brought in by the Romans is not known, and yet it is a matter of great importance. It would not be in place here to outline the many possibilities of such syncretism in the Grail question, but doubtless the very divergent views taken by such scholars as Nutt and Wesselofsky might here find some basis of reconciliation. And the long period of years from the introduction of Christianity until the appearance of Crestien's and Robert's poems is certainly ample time to allow for other eastern influences to have an effect. Thus the Grail might be originally Celtic in the concept of the Fisher King, and yet Diez's etymology³ be correct that the word *graal* = Prov. *grazal*, < *cratalis**, i. e., *cratus* (see Ducange, *Gloss. med. et inf. latin.*, s. v. *cratus*) for *crater* (cf. above the *crater* in the mysteries of Mithra). Pelles, also, may be the equivalent of the Welsh Pwyll and nevertheless reflect, through the medium of Ovid and the Provençal poets, the story of Peleus and the "wounding and healing lance," with which Wesselofsky connects the name⁴ (cf. the mention of Achilles in Perl.). Bron may be Bran and still we find Hebron as a variant. The *Beste glatissant* has several eastern parallels⁵—and so

¹ Rhys, *Hib. Lec.*, 196 ff.

² Pomponius Mela, *De Chorographia*, ed. Parthey, III, ch. 6.

³ *Wörterbuch*, 1887, p. 602.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 374.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 379–80.

on. The centers of syncretism would seem to be the monasteries, Glastonbury and Fécamp. Here Celtic, Gallo-Roman, Oriental, and Mediæval-Christian strains would have an opportunity to mix and to be fused together; but the evidence to that effect is limited, in the case of Fécamp, to the assertion of several Wauchier mss., an authority not above suspicion.¹ To be sure, the evidence for Glastonbury rests on the firmer foundation of internal evidence² (description of the Grail castle = Glastonbury abbey, Arthur's chapel ride in *Johannis Glastoniensis*, Perceval's ancestor Glais = Glast, etc., etc.); but here, too, the Grail theme was probably attracted by local Joseph and Arthur traditions, since Glastonbury records know nothing of it. Thus the stages whereby the primitive cult became the Grail legend of the twelfth century are likely to remain conjectural. Much depends certainly on the testimony of names, when they are attached to very similar ideas. Wauchier's Bleheris³ who,

¹ Brugger, *op. cit.*, 136 ff; Jeanroy, *Revue des lang. rom.*, L, 541-544.

² *Modern Philology*, I, 247-57.

³ *Romania*, XXXIV, 333-43; *Legend of Sir Perceval*, 288; Lot's "Bledericus de Cornwall" in *Romania*, XXVIII, 336. Concerning Bleheris, it is to be noted:

(1) The name is of common occurrence in Cymric territory.

(2) The ms. reads,

si com le conte Bleheris
qui fu nés e engenüis
en Gales dont je cont le conte
e qui si le contoit au conte
de Poitiers qui amoit l'estoire
e le tenoit en grant memoire
plus que nul autre ne faisoit. —Fo. 241^{vo}.

That is, the story was presumably *oral*, and Bleheris may have been simply a narrator.

(3) The 'Elucidation' states that Gawain overcame Blihos-Bliheris, whom no man at Arthur's court knew, but he

si très bons contes savoit
Que nus ne se peüst l'asser
De ses paroles escouter. —Potvin, II, vv. 170-2.

as Miss Weston discovered, *told* his *conte* to the Count of Poitiers (B. N. Add. 36,614, fo. 241^{vo}), was perhaps the purveyor of a Gawain-romance before Crestien's time, to which Wauchier and the Elucidation are indebted; but we are left in the dark concerning the contents of that work, which seems to have been a compilation of divergent stories. Though it may be urged, as regards the Grail, that the incidents Wauchier has in common with the Elucidation were probably contained in it, yet that question, too, needs to be probed further.

For the present we are thus thrown back on Crestien's romance as the earliest extant text. In the Christianizing process his influence seems to have been inconsiderable: is this due to his failure to understand the meaning of the story? In any case, the Grail episodes occupy relatively little space in his poem; they do not by any means dominate as they do in the other French Grail works, and the only possibly Christian elements in the procession are the 'plate' and the host (*oiste*) which sustains the life of the

He tells of the court of the Fisher King, etc. Hence again a narrator.

(4) The same text further on in one group of MSS. (B. N. f. 12577 fo. 133) contains a reference to a *grand conte* of which this is only a part, ending thus:

Cil de Loudon racontera
Que ce riche romans dira.

Miss Weston remarks, *Rom.*, xxxiv, 335, that *cil de Loudon* was not Wauchier nor the reputed author of the story, but a *jongleur*. Exactly. But that does not prevent us from regarding him as in the Comte de Poitiers's immediate *entourage*, since Loudon is near Poitiers.

(5) Bleheris is thus most likely, as Heinzel already suggested, the *famosus ille fabulator Bledhericus* of Giraldus Cambrensis, and one must agree with Gaston Paris (and Brugger, *op. cit.*) that he antedates Giraldus but by a little. Miss Weston informs me that Mr. Owen identifies him with a Bledhericus known in the *Brut y Tywysogion* and charters as *Latinarius* or 'interpreter,' whose dates are 1091-1147; cf. the *Gwentian Brut*, Rolls Series, London, 1860, p. 106.

Fisher King's father. A critical text is urgently needed. In the meanwhile it is idle to speculate on the basis of material consisting often of a single word or two. Of great moment, of course, is the book that Philip of Flanders gave the Champagne poet. Crestien¹ calls it a *livre*, the subject-matter of which is a *conte*, which he presents in the form of a *roumanz*. This sounds much like the verses in *Cligés* (vv. 20-23):

An un livres de l'aumeire

 De la fu li contes estrez,
 Don cest roumanz fist Crestiiens.

And knowing the sources there, we can judge to what extent he elaborated a situation by means of *motifs* taken from his general literary equipment. In the *Conte del Graal* his actual source may thus have been a sort of synopsis in which the Grail theme existed only in the barest outline; for Crestien's emphasis is on the biography of his hero, and this I take it need not have been in Count Philip's book. Yet Crestien builded better than he knew. He made the Grail legend enjoy literary vogue, and therefore those coming after him returned to the sources of which the *livre* gave only an imperfect synopsis. But the form of the tale they were powerless to change; that Crestien had fixed for all time. And so Wolfram reproduces the tale practically as Crestien had conceived it, as a test of chivalric conduct and moral fitness, in which the interest centers not in the Grail but in the knight whose worth has been revealed:

Wie Herzeloyden kint den grâl
 erwarp.²

Not so the author of the metrical *Joseph*. He knows nothing of Perceval. He is bent on explaining the Grail,

¹ Potvin, II, 308, v. 67.

² *Parzival*, § 827, 6.

the precious vessel containing the blood of the slain god, which he likens to the eucharist. The extant text is assuredly Christian; so much so, indeed, that one wonders at the insistence of the author and suspects his motive. Yet in one respect the primitive basis seems to me nowhere more evident. For if the *Joseph* were really Christian, would not Joseph and Peter have sufficed to bring the holy vessel to England? And if, as Heinzel¹ maintains, the ecclesiastical view was that Joseph remained in the Orient, though legend allowed him to come to Glastonbury, then could not Nicodemus have brought the Grail? The author of the *Joseph* knew the apocrypha; moreover, he mentions Nicodemus as associated with Joseph. In *Perl.* we have an example of the Grail lineage springing from him. Hence it is clear, as Nutt² and Heinzel³ have affirmed, that the author has amalgamated two traditions; namely, the Joseph story and that of Brons and the fish. The latter, we recall, Nutt connects with Finn through the medium of the Welsh Bran. In this I agree with him, for Bran, as we have seen, is an evident water-deity, and his attributes and the curious incident of his 'head' are indications of an agrarian nature.⁴ Thus the *Joseph* preserves for us, in spite of its Christian garb, the one clear instance of the connection of the Grail rites with the class of primitive beliefs from which they sprang.

¹ *Gralromane*, 92, 95. Cf. also Hulme, *The Middle-English Harrowing of Hell*, *E. E. T. S.*, 1907, pp. lxxvii ff.

² *Studies*, 66, 218.

³ *Gralromane*, 92.

⁴ Rhys, *Hib. Lect.*, 666, where Bran is said to be a Chthonian deity; cf. also, *Celtic Folklore*, 552. Of great interest is the Amaethon, son of Don, mentioned in the *Kulhwch and Olwen* (Loth I, 240); his agrarian nature has long been recognized (see Rhys, *Arth. Leg.*, 42, 157, 245-246), but Rhys's identification of him with the Amangons of the 'Elucidation' (v. 63) seems open to question. *Amangons* suggests *Mangon*; cf. above, p. 397. For further details see Miss Weston, *Sir Perceval*, I, 276-282.

But granting that the basis of the Grail theme is an agrarian cult, the various elements of myth which helped to shape the poetic story remain to be determined. Many of these are accessible, I believe, in Celtic literature. In making this statement I am aware of the great liability to error involved in such an investigation ; for we are in danger of identifying what was originally quite distinct, and story *motifs* repeat themselves like the plots of the drama. But though the historical and purely literary elements in Arthurian story demand our attention first, because they provide the securest footing, nevertheless the mythic side is of very great importance. The problem, of course, is to single out what part is myth, what part history, and what part individual fancy. Difficult as this is, it is made less so by the fact that the mediæval romancer often failed to grasp the significance of his material, which thus assumed curiously contradictory shapes in the woof of his indiscriminating fancy.

As a working hypothesis Rhys's ¹ suggestion, after all, succeeds best in defining this mythic side, from the point of view of the recurrent elements in the stories. I cannot refrain from recapitulating his view here as it appears to work out in the instances I have studied. The dark divinity, living beyond or beneath the water, is the task master of the hero of light ; by one means or another, directly by his own efforts or indirectly through a messenger, beautiful or loathsome—as circumstances require—he lures the latter to his abode ; there he remains until freed by the efforts of a friend, often the culture-hero himself. Variations on this theme are as many as the human fancy can conceive ; but the initial, organic idea is constant. In the particular story group we are considering, Gawain or Perceval, Lancelot or Galaad are con-

¹*Arth. Leg.*, 233, 37.

stantly being summoned by messenger or incident to the court of the Fisher King, and King Arthur's main effort is to recover them and maintain the integrity of his order. Thus the mythic force of Arthurian Romance in general is the primitive struggle of man to compel and control the natural, specifically agricultural, forces on which his existence depends; the particular form in which the Grail stories have handed it down is as a life-cult resembling the Greek mysteries.

WM. A. NITZE.

XVI.—THE LITURGICAL BASIS OF THE TOWNELEY MYSTERIES.

The Towneley Mysteries have two remarkable characteristics which have attracted the attention of scholars: they contain a number of plays borrowed directly from the York cycle and they also contain a number of other plays so conspicuous for their highly dramatic form that the cycle may be said to have reached in them the highest point in the dramatic development of the English Mystery. Various theories have been advanced to account for the presence of these two sets of plays in Towneley and especially for the relationship, and its extent, of Towneley and York. The two theories of greatest interest are those of Professor Davidson¹ and Professor Hohlfeld.² A third, advanced by Mr. Pollard,³ is practically the same as Professor Hohlfeld's, with one or two slight modifications, which hardly concern us here.

Professor Davidson's theory is, in one respect, peculiar. He thinks the Towneley cycle to be the work of a single compiler, working in couplets and quatrains, and drawing his plays from various sources. Subsequent studies of the nature of the cycles, however, have proved them to be, not the work of single editors, but a growth, a gradual accumulation of the work of a number of editors. A closer examination of the cycle reveals the fact that Davidson's editor working in couplets and quatrains was in reality two, one using couplets, and the other quatrains, and that a considerable interval of time separated them.

¹ Davidson, *English Mystery Plays* (Yale Thesis, 1892), p. 129.

² *Anglia*, XI, 219 ff. "Die altenglischen Kollektivmysterien, etc."

³ Introduction to *The Towneley Plays*, E. E. T. S. edition.

There is, in fact, evidence here of a certain amount of growth.

The Hohlfeld-Pollard theory, on the other hand, partially recognizes the fact of growth within the cycle. It attempts to answer two questions: What is the extent and nature of the relationship between York and Towneley?—What is the relationship between the two groups which give Towneley its importance?¹ Hohlfeld has made a careful comparison of Towneley and York, play by play, and arrives at the following grouping of the T plays in regard to their relationship with Y:—²

1. Word for word borrowing of entire plays: Plays 8, 18, 25, 26, 30.
2. A general imitation of entire plays with a borrowing of isolated passages: Pl. 10, 14, 15.
3. A general imitation of entire plays without the presence of parallel passages: Pl. 16, 20.
4. A word for word borrowing of certain parts and a general imitation of others: Pl. 22.
5. General imitation of isolated portions: Pl. 21.
6. Parallel passages without other agreement: Pl. 23.
7. Without direct evidence of any influencing by Y: Pl. 1, 2, 3, 7, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 27, 28, 31, 32.
8. Not present in Y: Pl. 5, 6, 9, 24.

Without going into the question of the correctness of this grouping, it is to be noted that Hohlfeld found, generally speaking, that Y had influenced T in two ways. First, there were the direct borrowings, and, second, there was a certain amount of what seemed to him general imi-

¹ The first of these may, for convenience, be called the York, or Y group; the second because of references which it contains, to Wakefield, the Wakefield, or W group.

² *Anglia*, XI, 307.

tation, extending in certain plays to the borrowing of isolated phrases. His conclusion upon these data is ¹ that the original author (*Verfasser*), of T was a man who was acquainted with Y, from which he made the direct borrowings. In certain cases he did not have a copy of the plays, but constructed from his recollection of the structure of Y, incorporating such phrases as he could remember. In other cases he seems to have written independently. He always followed biblical sources closely. He was followed by another author, who wrote, with little reference to biblical sources, the humorous plays to which T owes its greater interest. Mr. Pollard modifies this view, giving three stages of growth instead of two, by placing in a first or earliest stage those plays in which Hohlfeld finds no direct relationship between T and Y.² So much for theories concerning Towneley alone.

There is a third theory of the highest importance to the present discussion: the general theory of cyclic growth advanced by Mr. E. K. Chambers. In the light of this theory, it will be possible to discover the limitations of the other two just described. Chambers's theory is later than the two just given. It is applied to no special cycle, but attempts to outline a course of development which is common to all. Hohlfeld³ and Davidson,⁴ as well as other scholars, recognize that the ultimate source of the cycles was in the liturgy of the church; but they do not concern themselves with tracing the connection between the liturgical and the guild plays with any exactness. It remained for Chambers to collect the data upon this larger question. A statement of his conclusions is a statement

¹ *Anglia*, XI, 307 ff.

² *The Towneley Plays*, Introduction, xxvii, xxviii.

³ *Anglia*, XI, 239. Davidson, p. 6, etc.

of his theory.¹ He believes that the growth of the cycles is a literary evolution embracing three periods:—

1. *Liturgical.* The development within the liturgy of plays on Christ's Birth, Resurrection, and possibly his Passion.

2. *Transitional.* The secularization of these plays by translation into the vernacular and by enlargement, either within already existing scenes, or by the addition of new scenes from biblical or apocryphal history; until the cycle came to embrace the whole cosmic order from Creation to Judgment. The completion of this historic cycle closes this period.

3. *Final.* Secularization of the plays is complete. They are in the hands of the guilds, where they remain, suffering constant change; acted now by one trade, now by another; re-written and re-arranged to suit new conditions; but firmly fixed in the cyclic form.

Emphasis must be placed upon the fact that this growth is an evolution. The limits of the periods are not sharply defined. They merge into each other. Not all cycles reached the full development, nor did all grow with the same rapidity.

It is evident at once that both Hohlfield and Davidson have approached the question of Towneley's growth from a different point of view than would have been probable, if they had been acquainted with Chambers's theory. Their field of vision is narrower. To their minds the growth of Towneley is a question of definite authors or compilers. For them, the cycle did not grow normally out of its liturgical source. They recognized that, generally speaking, the ultimate source of all cyclic plays must have been the liturgy, but they did not seem to realize

¹ E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, vol. 2, chap. xviii-xxii.

that the ultimate source of this very Towneley cycle might well have been specific liturgical plays from which the present cycle had developed by gradual growth; a growth in which all questions of editors or of compilers can refer only to the final stages. For the cycle, as it now exists, exists in the final stages of its development. The plays which make it up are none of them liturgical or transitional in form. In other words, the theories of Davidson and Hohlfeld do not look beyond the Final, or at most the Final and late Transitional stages of growth, as given by Chambers. It would not be strange if this narrower view of the case has led to a misapprehension of the facts; or at least has laid open to question the conclusions at which Hohlfeld and Davidson have arrived.

Hohlfeld bases his theory upon the following facts.

1. Certain plays are borrowed directly from York.
2. Others resemble York closely in general structure and arrangement; some of these contain parallel phraseology in places.

3. Certain other plays show a dramatic power much in advance of the rest of the cycle. It is upon the first two that he has based that part of his theory which assigns most of the plays to an author acquainted with York, who worked in three ways: either writing on a York framework; or borrowing directly from York; or doing independent, original work of his own. Laying aside the question whether one author would use such remarkably divergent methods, especially in a day of little originality, it is apparent, when we come to consider, in the light of Chambers's theory, the facts which Hohlfeld has discovered, that a legitimate question may be raised concerning the second. May not the resemblance in general arrangement, we may ask, have arisen from a common liturgical source of which the parallel phraseology

is a remnant in translation, surviving through years of independent growth? It is out of this interesting question that the main inquiry of the present paper has developed.

Turning to Davidson's theory, we find it to be based upon a single fact. He discovered that certain quatrains and couplets seemed to be an editor's work and concluded that this man compiled the cycle as it now is. This theory takes no account of any theory of growth. It asks no questions as to the method by which the various plays attained such a development that the compiler could make use of them in his cycle. It simply suggests that he collected them. That this theory should have been advanced by Davidson is rather surprising, since he devotes a good part of his discussion to tracing the development of the guild plays from the liturgical, and, in fact, finds evidence of this development in certain isolated scenes in Towneley and York.¹

These two theories are thus found to be limited to Chambers's Final Period. The present discussion, on the other hand, will concern itself primarily with his first period. It will deal with the question of Towneley's liturgical source and is, therefore, of necessity, limited to those portions of Towneley, which according to Chambers's theory, might have had a liturgical source, leaving for another time any discussion of plays possibly, or obviously,

¹ Davidson, pp. 6 ff. I have already remarked that Davidson's compiler is in reality two editors, one using couplets and the other quatrains (see above, p. 419). It is of importance to note that the couplet man has worked only in the two groups (of the Hohlfeld-Pollard grouping) which do not contain direct borrowings from York. These borrowings contain no couplets, whereas all three groups contain quatrains, and they are especially characteristic of the York borrowings. The inference from this is that, contrary to Hohlfeld's idea, the borrowings are the last addition to the cycle.

Transitional or Final additions to the cycle. The problem is: Is the liturgical source of Towneley traceable? If traceable, how extensive was it? And in addition to these questions another may be asked, to which the exigencies of the argument will compel an answer: Are there any other extant cycles in which the same liturgical source is traceable? These questions are fundamental. Once they are answered, it ought to be possible to proceed to a coherent tracing of the complete course of development through which Towneley passed.

For the solution of the problem raised in these questions certain things are necessary. On the side of the theory there must be a careful limitation of each of the three stages of cyclic growth, that they may be easily distinguished. On the side of the cycle, there must be some opportunity for comparison with other cycles; a comparison through which Transitional and Final accretions may, if possible, be eliminated. Such a cycle we have in York, with its many affinities to Towneley already noted by Hohlfeld and others.¹ Such a cycle, it will appear, we have also in the fragment of true Coventry left to us. The indications of such a cycle we have in the Beverly list of cyclic plays, which bears a striking resemblance to the lists of Y, T, and true Cov.

A comparison such as I have indicated should result, if the cycles have a common liturgical source only, in the discovery of a common fundamental framework. But, that the comparison may be successful, it is obvious that certain cautions must be observed and some definite standard for determining a common liturgical source must be evolved. In order to do this, a rather more elaborate

¹ See above, pp. 419 ff.

description of the limits and nature of each of Chambers's periods must be made.¹

The Liturgical Period closed, strictly speaking, when translation into the vernacular commenced. In isolated cases the vernacular and Latin may both have been used in the service. Such the rubrics would indicate to be the nature of the Resurrection Fragments discovered by Professor Skeat at Shrewsbury.² But these isolated instances only emphasize the rule, a rule of great importance in the comparisons we are to undertake. For the presence of common rhymes in two texts of the same scene which are under comparison would indicate a common source in the vernacular, and therefore a common source from either the Transitional or Final Periods; whereas two texts derived from a common liturgical source would contain a similar development of the thought, and possibly similar phrases arising from translation of the same original, but hardly any number of similar rhymes.

The liturgical period, then, is characterized by the use of Latin. In addition to this, it is necessary to define both its limits and the typical form of the liturgical plays. The earliest, or Resurrection Play, attained considerable development within the liturgy, containing scenes from the time the Jews warn Pilate that the tomb should be guarded, up to and including the Resurrection, and thereafter through the appearance to Mary, the Walk to Emmaus, and the Appearance to Thomas. Instead of being split up into a number of plays, this liturgical drama was a single play with a number of scenes. Internal development was subsequently to enlarge these scenes to such an extent that the single play broke up into a number of

¹ For detailed discussion see Chambers, vol. II.

² *Academy* (London), Jan. 11, 1890.

plays centering around the Resurrection. But this is a Transitional development. It is important to remember that in the liturgy these plays were simply scenes of one long play written in Latin. These facts have an important bearing upon the cyclic development. Because of them any divergence from type in a liturgic play could generally arise in only three ways: (1) the order of the scenes might be changed; (2) new scenes might be added; (3) old scenes might be dropped. The exigencies of the Latin text and the church service would prohibit much lengthening of scenes by extending the dialogue.

The second, or Christmas Play, centering around Christ's birth, also attained considerable development within the liturgy. By the close of the liturgical period it may be assumed to include scenes from the coming of the Shepherds to worship, through the Flight into Egypt.

In connection with the Christmas service there grew up another play called the *Prophetæ*, which has an important bearing upon the present discussion. It was originally a sermon, a portion of which purported to give prophecies of the coming Christ by sacred and profane historical characters. This portion was subsequently dialogued and then dramatized, so that out of it developed a series of incidents, like that of Balaam and his Ass, connected with Old Testament history. From them was evolved a series of Old Testament plays. This was the usual development.¹ In certain cases, however, Chambers found the *Prophetæ* as a prologue to the *Stella*, in which the main prophecies are hurriedly reviewed. This seems to have been the case in Towneley, York, and true Coventry. The greatest development of the *Prophetæ* must necessarily have been Transitional.

¹ Chambers, vol. 2, pp. 52 ff.

Chambers finds few indications of a Passion play within the Liturgy, though the earliest Passion Play in existence is wholly in Latin and remarkably like a liturgical play.

Such are the limits of the liturgical plays, as Chambers lays them down. It must be remembered, however, that this is a general theory, and that particular examples may show more or less variation from type.

The growth during the Transitional and Final Periods may be summarized with much less detail. Development within the liturgy was mainly confined to the addition of scenes to older plays. This continues in Transition. New scenes are added. A Passion Play appears. The *Prophetæ* develops into a series of Old Testament plays from the Fall of Lucifer down. The events of the Christmas play are linked to those of the Passion by scenes from Christ's life. A Harrowing of Hell connects Passion and Resurrection, and all is closed by a play on the Judgment. The cycle is filled out. But the use of the vernacular gives a chance for dialogue before impossible. Conversations are elaborated. Scenes which were merely dumb show are invested with a dialogue and drawn out to a great length. Comedy develops. The liturgical plays, long in themselves, become inordinately long and split up, each scene becoming a separate play. The Final Period begins when, completely separated from the church, the plays are handed over to the guilds, there to go through constant editing and shifting until interest in them finally dies out and they are abandoned.

From all this may be deduced certain obvious cautions with regard to a comparison that attempts to bring out similarity in liturgical source.

1. Not all the plays could by any possibility have developed from the liturgy.

2. The chief indication of liturgical source will be a

similar framework in the texts compared, running, not through single plays in a series, but through the whole series of plays which may have made up the scenes of a single liturgical play, whether Christmas or Resurrection.

3. This framework may or may not be indicated by similar phraseology. In those scenes where there has been simply translation from the original, with little enlargement, there may be considerable similar phraseology. But if enlargement has taken place, the similar phrases may be only tags or catchwords, remaining from the original episode.

4. This similar phraseology must not contain rhymes common to the compared texts. The presence of rhymes is evidence of a vernacular, that is a Transitional, source.

With these cautions in mind we may state our rule for determining a common liturgical source. If it is possible to discover running through the plays of the same liturgical group in two or more cycles a common fundamental framework upon which all the variations in each cycle have been superimposed, we are warranted in assuming, for that group in these cycles, a common liturgical source. Our assumption is strengthened if a similar phraseology exists which corresponds in a more or less fragmentary way to the development of the story as it is shown in the common framework.¹

¹ Concerning these similar phrases it may be objected that they are nothing more than translations of the same biblical source, rather than of a liturgical original. And in some scenes this would appear to be the case, were it not that in other scenes they show a common variation from the Bible story, which is evidently originally a liturgical variation. It must be remembered, in this connection, that each of these plays is but a scene in a long liturgical play, which is much elaborated, and must be considered in its relation to the other scenes of the play.

We come, then, to consider the growth of Towneley in the light of Chambers's theory. The method will be by a comparison with York and true Coventry, which will incidently help us to some conclusions concerning those two cycles as well as Towneley.

According to the limits for the liturgical plays laid down by Chambers, those of Towneley which may have grown from a liturgical source are: from the *Christmas Play*, plays xi through xvi (Shepherds, Magi, Flight into Egypt, Herod the Great); from the *Resurrection Play*, plays xxvi, xxvii, xxviii (The Resurrection, containing also an Appearance to Mary, The Pilgrims to Emmaus, and Thomas of India). It will be convenient to consider the Christmas series first.

THE CHRISTMAS PLAYS.

A glance at the titles of the plays preceding and following those mentioned above as possibly the scenes of the liturgical play out of which T developed, shows that they do not include all the plays in T upon events connected with Christ's birth and childhood. The series commences with play x on the Annunciation and runs through play xviii, Christ with the Doctors in the Temple. On the strength of Chambers's theory alone we have no right to include any but plays xii through xvii in our comparison of T, Y, and true Cov. But we must remember that Chambers's theory is general and from it particular cycles may in some measure vary. This consideration would lead us to include all of the Christmas plays in T in our comparison, in order to see whether any variation from type may be discovered in Towneley. The most superficial examination of the titles of scenes in York and

true. Cov. reveals a similarity which further impels us to this examination. The scenes of the Christmas plays in the three cycles are:—

<i>Towneley: Pl. 10–18.</i>	<i>York: Pl. 12–20.</i>	<i>Coventry: Shear. Tailors; Weav.</i>
10. Prophetic Prologue. Annunciation.	12. Prophetic Prologue. Annunciation. Salutation of Elizabeth.	1. Shearmen and Tailors. Prophetic Prologue. Annunciation.
Joseph's Trouble about Mary.	13. Joseph's Trouble about Mary.	Joseph's Trouble.
11. Salutation of Elizabeth.	14. Birth of Jesus.	Birth of Jesus.
12 and 13. The two Shepherds Plays.	15. The Shepherds.	Shepherds.
14. The Magi.	16, 17. The Magi.	The Magi.
15. Flight into Egypt.	18. Flight into Egypt.	Flight into Egypt.
16. Herod The Great (The Innocents).	19. Innocents.	Innocents.
17. Purification of Mary.	41. Purification.	2. Weavers' Play. Purification.
18. Christ with the Doctors in the Temple.	20. The Doctors.	The Doctors.

It is evident from this list that the extent of the group in the three cycles is practically the same. Discrepancies may be noted as follows:—

1. The Salutation of Elizabeth precedes Joseph's Trouble in York, follows it in Towneley, is not present in Coventry.
2. Towneley contains no account of the Birth, but does contain two Shepherds plays. In Coventry the Shepherds play and the Birth are linked together in the following order: scene one of the Shepherds play, one of the Birth; a second Shepherds scene, a second Birth scene.
3. The group consists in T of nine plays; in York of ten, one of which, the Purification, is out of place; ¹ in Coventry of two.

¹ Miss L. T. Smith, *The York Plays*, Introduction, p. xxi, and note, p. 433.

Of the three, Coventry has the more primitive form, since the original liturgical play has remained almost intact, only two scenes having broken away. The discussion of Chambers has shown that the direction of growth was towards the separation, rather than towards the grouping, of scenes. This is an indication that the transitional growth of Coventry was very incomplete. It seems almost to have stood still for a long period. The other discrepancies noted above will be considered later. The one thing especially noteworthy is that the comparison reveals a marked similarity in the titles in these three cycles. Whatever value this comparison may have is increased upon examination of other cycles, Chester and so-called Coventry, which, while they reveal a superficial similarity in title, do not show so close a similarity to any of these three as these do to each other. That this is true will develop during the discussion.

Unless the general similarity were supported by weightier reasons, the comparison might well stop here. But it is noteworthy that of the plays mentioned above¹ in which Hohlfeld finds a general imitation of York by Towneley, either with or without borrowing of isolated passages, four (10, 14, 15, 16), are in this group, and all but one in the limited portion of the group which Chambers's theory would lead us to think liturgical in source. Of course, if Hohlfeld's theory of general borrowing from Y be not admitted, his general imitation becomes a general similarity, and a general similarity is the first of our tests for a liturgical source. That one of these plays, 10, is the first of the extant T series of Christmas scenes, would lead us to a more extensive investigation of the whole series, rather than of plays 12 to 16 alone.

¹ See page 420.

But so far the discussion of these general points has produced no reason, other than similarity in titles of scenes, why true Coventry should be included in the comparison. There is still another characteristic which links these three cycles together and at the same time distinguishes them from all other English Mystery plays. They each have, as noted in the list of titles, a prologue of prophets prefixed to the first of their Christmas scenes, the Annunciation. So peculiar is this characteristic that it has been the basis of considerable discussion and considerable tracing of relationships, by borrowing, between the cycles.¹ But I have already mentioned the fact that Chambers² discovered two distinct developments of the Prophetæ, one into the series of Old Testament plays and the other into the prologue to the Stella, or Christmas play. Can the presence of such a prologue in each of these three cycles, and in no others, be a mere coincidence? In this connection is it not a remarkable fact that it has been impossible to discover any evidence of Old Testament Plays in connection with true Coventry?³ Is not the fact of a similar prophetic prologue in Y and T, when coupled with the fact of absolutely dissimilar Old Testament plays, a hint that Y and T developed from the same liturgical source? And is not the presence of the prologue in Coventry, coupled with the absence of Old Testament plays, a hint that, in any comparison for determining the liturgical relationships of Y and T, true Coventry should be included? Does not the fact that this prophetic prologue is prefixed to the Annunciation

¹ See Davidson and Hohlfeld.

² Chambers, vol. 2, pp. 52 ff.

³ While T and Y coincide in the titles of the Old Testament scenes through Abraham and Isaac, they disagree thereafter, and where they coincide in title the framework differs.

furnish an indication that the whole series from Annunciation through the Flight should be included in the comparison, especially when this series is only one play in Coventry?

This analysis and comparison of the Christmas series in Y, T, and true Cov. will endeavor to show the probability that this series in each of the three cycles is a development under differing circumstances from the same liturgical source. But it must be remembered that such evidence as may be offered, wholly internal as it is, can establish no more than a probability, which can be argued for, but never positively proved. It points towards a theory but does not determine a fact.

To bring out more clearly the points of this comparison, a corresponding liturgical play is given, as far as there is such a play extant. As the liturgical play is only similar to, and not the direct source of, the cyclic play, there is not exact agreement in any one case. Nor has it been thought necessary to use the same play throughout. Rather, scenes from different plays, which correspond most exactly to the cyclic play, have been chosen. For the scenes up to the Shepherds, a Benedictbeuern play,¹ containing a prophetic prologue, has been used. For the Shepherds and Magi, and also for the Innocents, use has been made of a Magi from Fleury.² For the Flight a Freising³ play has been used because it is more detailed.

There is, of course, a certain amount of divergence in each cycle, due in large part to constant re-editing. There has been, besides enlargement of certain scenes, some shifting in the order and a certain amount of omission. As it is the purpose of this paper to discover whether, amidst

¹ Du Ménil, *Origines Latines du Théâtre Moderne*, p. 187.

² Du Ménil, pp. 162, 175.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

SCENE
y
a
e.

Coventry, Shearmen and Tailors.¹

York, Pl. 12, scene 1.

1. Prologue by Isaye. (1-46)²

Prologue. (st. 1-12).

Man having fallen by Adam's sin and the Serpent's g

2. Annunciation.

Gabriel.

Hayle, Mare, full of grace!
Owre Lord God ys with the.

(47-48)

Ang. Hayle! Marie! full
and blysse, (13) n-
Oure Lord God is with ply
al

3. Mary expresses wonder. (51-54)

Gab. Dred the nothyng, meydin,
of this; (55)

Mary expresses wonder (14)
Ang. Ne drede þe noght, þe
marie ee

Wherefore in the grace schalbe
fownde; (61)

For thow schalt conseyye apon
this grownde (62)

Consayue and bere a child
(14) l's

4. *Mary.* I marvell soore how thatt
mabe. (68)

Manus cumpany knev I neyuer
yett,

Mary. Howe sulde it be, I lic
I knawe no man.

5. *Gab.* The Wholle Gost in the
schall lyght, (72)

Ang. The Halygast in þe
(17) rn,

6. *Gab.* Beholde Eylesabeth thy
cosyn clene, (82)

Ang. Loo, Elyzabeth, þi
rts
en

7. *Mary.* Asse his one hande-
mayde I submyt me. (91)

Mary. Goddis handmayde in
here, (18) not
ue

¹ The text of true Coventry used is that found in Manly, *Spec^{las}
Pre-Shaksperean Drama*, vol. 1, pp. 120 ff. ne,

² Figures in () indicate stanzas in Y and T, lines in Cov. lis-
ust

4:

fu
at
p:
C

in
p:
a
sa
su
ca
ar
w:

so
th
si
th
be
R:
m:
th
co:
St
be
Fr

ea
ha
in
it

1
2

all this change, a certain fundamental likeness can be made out, it has seemed best to take up the scenes one by one and dispose of each in turn, rather than to attempt a consideration and comparison of the whole group at once.

Scene 1: The Annunciation.

The comparison brings out:—

1. The common prophetic prologue.
2. The common fundamental framework. On comparison this fundamental framework is found to follow scripture more closely than the liturgical play in two particulars. The liturgical play contains no expression of fear on Mary's part, followed by the reassuring speech of Gabriel; nor does it contain any reference to Elizabeth. This reference to Elizabeth is in all three of the cyclic plays, as is the reassuring speech of Gabriel. Mary expresses fear in Y and Cov., but not in T. This is probably lost from T; otherwise there would be no reason for Gabriel's reassuring speech. The fact of its presence in Y and Cov., with which T otherwise agrees, would also indicate its former presence in T. These common deviations from Benedictbeuern only emphasize the common fundamental framework of the cyclic scenes.
3. The great similarity in phraseology. This similarity does not extend to the use of common rhymes in the three cycles. It evidently arises from a translation of the liturgical source without extensive enlargement. This liturgical play must have followed scripture even more closely than does Benedictbeuern, since it contains the episode of Mary's fear and the last reference to Elizabeth. In the cycles scripture is followed even more closely than the citations would indicate, as only those parts necessary to bring out the fundamental framework have been quoted. Indeed, it might be thought that the similarity in phraseology arose from the use of the scriptures alone and not from the translation of a liturgical source, did it continue without variation from scripture throughout all the Christmas series. But subsequent scenes, for instance the very next one, contain similarities in phraseology where it is possible to discover no direct scriptural source. The Christmas series must be considered as a whole.

This is one of the plays in which Hohlfeld found T to be a general imitation of Y. We have discovered a general similarity to true Cov. Davidson¹ found this striking similarity in phraseology to run through the so-called Coventry and Chester as well. He thinks it indicates that this scene in all the cycles had the same liturgical source. This is, however, but one scene of a long liturgical play; and, further, the fundamental framework of Chester and the so-called Coventry becomes radically different from this series as the play develops. It is better, therefore, to consider that the similarity here noted arises from a literal use of the biblical source throughout this scene in the different plays from which the cycles developed. That Y, T, and true Cov. have a common source is only to be proved by the discovery that the common fundamental framework extends throughout the group. Davidson stated his conclusion thus:¹ "When agreeing passages are scriptural quotations one cannot base upon them a theory of direct interdependence among extant plays; but must rather consider that they had a common liturgical source." This last clause I would modify by saying: provided the fundamental framework of the groups containing the passages is the same. Otherwise they must be considered to have grown from different liturgical plays each closely following the scriptural source.

As far as this scene in T, Y, and true Cov. is concerned, we find it responding to the test we have set. The three cycles show a common fundamental framework. This is emphasized by a close similarity in phraseology, arising from translation of the original without extensive enlargement.

¹ Davidson, pp. 158-163.

Coventry.

The scene is missing.

Benedictbeuern.

1. The first of this play is Luke I,
42, 43.

Unde hoc mihi, etc.: *Ex quo facta
est vox salutationes, etc.*

These verses form part of 3 in
Y and T.

3. *Eliz.* Benedicta te in mulieribus.
Tuque portabis, etc. (v. 41)

4. *Mary.* Magnificat mea, etc.

5. Deinde recedat Elizabeth.

Scene 2: The Salutation.

This scene is lacking in Coventry. In T it follows Joseph's Trouble; in Y it precedes it. As the chronology of Y is correct, the scene is given second. The comparison brings out:—

1. The common fundamental framework of T and Y. This varies markedly from Benedictbeuern in that it discards scripture in the introduction, making this an inquiry after relatives. In Y Mary makes the inquiry and then Elizabeth welcomes her. In T Elizabeth first welcomes Mary and then makes the inquiry. The three remaining episodes are the same in both plays and in the Benedictbeuern.
2. Considerable similar phraseology. In the introduction the welcome of Elizabeth and the inquiry contain very similar phrases, but without the common rhymes which would indicate their transitional origin. The fact that the characters who speak the phrases are different in each cycle is of no importance. These might vary with every editor. The phrasal correspondence in the last three episodes is so like that of the Annunciation that it did not seem necessary to detail it in the comparison.

This fundamental similarity between Y and T would indicate a common source for them. The absence of the scene from Cov. may be accounted for in two ways. Either it never existed and the scene in Y and T is an addition from transitional sources, or it has been dropped by an editor. The latter seems the more reasonable explanation; for, if from a transitional source, the Y and T scenes would have been likely to have had common rhymes as well as similar phrases. Nor would the variation in order in the introduction have been so probable. That in itself indicates a common source more remote than the transitional period. The introduction would have become fixed by translation before it reached T and Y. On the other hand, the text of Cov. which we have is late and has been thoroughly revised by one Robert

Croo (See the finis of the play). The next scene resumes the likeness to T and Y which we found in the preceding Annunciation scene. This is strong evidence that there must have been at one time a similar scene of the Salutation in Coventry. The variation in order between T and Y is doubtless editorial also and arose through the separation of the long liturgical play into shorter plays: Y combining Annunciation and Salutation; T, Annunciation and Joseph's Trouble.

In this Salutation scene Davidson finds the same connection with Chester and so-called Coventry that he found in the scene of the Annunciation. Here the same objections prevail, with the additional one that neither contains the introduction common to T and Y.

So this second scene corresponds to our test in the case of T and Y, with strong probability that a similar scene is lost from Coventry.

Scene 3: Joseph's Trouble About Mary.

This scene is not in Benedictbeuern, nor in any other liturgical and transitional plays which have come down to us. But it shows so many similar characteristics in Y, T, and true Cov. that the comparison enables us to judge with fair accuracy of the common source. The original scene certainly embraced the following events. Joseph greets Mary and reproaches her. She protests her innocence. He is incredulous and says she is deceiving him. Again she protests and he leaves in sorrow and disgust, only to be told by the angel that she spoke the truth. He returns, is forgiven, and they start for Bethlehem. This outline is followed, with greatest exactness by Cov.; an indication that its transitional growth is far from as extensive as that of the other two. The great

Covent

1. Ba
Jo
Ho

2. Me
Se

3. Me
Bu

Jo

M

4. Je
W

5. M

N

6.

7.

8.

addition in T and Y is the story of Joseph's marriage; but it is an independent addition in each, for it occurs at different places and is developed in different ways. In Y the *puellae* who first meet the returning Joseph are characters in the play. In T they are only referred to by Joseph in the course of his story. The points brought out by the comparison between the cycles are:—

1. The almost identical words with which Joseph first addresses Mary in each cycle.
2. His request to know whose the child is.
3. Mary's reply. This has been elaborated in Cov., but the stanza brings out the same meaning as in Y and T.
4. The common reply of Joseph, "I am beguiled," varied in T.
5. Mary's reply. "Ye are not beguiled. With synne was I never fylde." The common rhyme in Coventry and York is noteworthy. But Y has distorted the sense. In T the rhyme is missing.
6. Joseph takes leave of Mary.
7. The speech of the angel.
8. Joseph begs Mary's forgiveness. Note that Cov. and T agree in Joseph's first speech given in the comparison; that Y and T agree in Mary's reply; and that Cov. and T agree in the forgiveness by Mary.
9. Cov. and Y make the two start for Bethlehem.

I have indicated in 8 above how two of the cycles agree while one varies; and that it is not always the same two which agree. Other instances occur in the play:—

1. In Cov. and T Mary replies to Joseph's first greeting. Not so in Y.
2. In Y and T Mary's defence is the same, "Sir ye and god." This is more elaborate in Cov.
3. The doubt of Joseph, "I am beguiled," expressed similarly in Y and Cov., is different in T.
4. Rhyme, *begylde*, *defyled*, in Cov. and Y. Not in T.

If it had been found that the same two were always similar and the same one always different, it would have

been possible to say nothing but that the varying one had a different source. When, however, we find the variations running Y, Cov., T, T, Y, Cov., Y, T, and that some of the differences even here, as in 2 above, are only a matter of elaboration, the result is to add to the argument for a common source with individual variations. The similarity is fundamental; the dissimilarity, editorial.

The rhyme in Cov. and Y, noted above, would seem in itself to indicate a direct borrowing of one by the other. But I am not certain that an isolated example of that kind should be considered, especially when T does not contain the rhyme, though evidently from the same source, and when the meaning of the corresponding phrases differs in the two.

In Chester this scene has never been expanded beyond a single speech by Joseph and the angel's reply. So-called Coventry is very similar to T, Y, and true Coventry, and suggests a borrowing from an older form of those cycles and, afterwards, a separate enlargement.

So-called Coventry, p. 117, lines 22-23:—¹

Jos. How hast thou ferde, jentyl mayde,
Whyl I have be out of londe?

p. 118, line 19:

Jos. Sey me, Mary, this childys fadyr ho is?
12. *Mary.* The fadyr of hevyn and ȝe it is,
16. This childe is Goddys and ȝour.
17. *Jos.* Goddys childe! thou lyist, in fay;
21. *Jos.* But ȝit I sey, Mary, whoos childe is this?
22. *Mary.* Goddys and ȝoure, I sey i-wis.

Also p. 118, line 23:—

Jos. ȝa! ȝa! alle olde men to me take tent,

¹ The text of so-called Coventry is Halliwell, *Ludus Coventriae*.

SCENE 4, THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

Coventry:—

1. *Mary*. God haue marcy, Jo-
soffe, my spowse
soo dere; (184)
All profettis herto dothe
beyre wyttnes,
The were tyme now draith nere
That my chyld wolbe borne,
wyche ys Kyng of
blis.
2. *Jos*. Loo! blessid Mare, here
schall ye lend, (192)
3. *Joseph* (194-203) goes for
help. Compare Chester, p.
109. (This seems to be a
late change. Originally he
must have gone for fuel as
in Y; for he brings no help,
and the last scene is like Y.)
The child is born.
(Here a shepherd scene inter-
venes.) 204-277.
4. *Joseph* entering worships.
(284)
Now welcum to me, the Makar
of mon,
With all the omage thatt I
con;
5. *Joseph* takes the child in his
arms to warm it. When
Mary asks it back he says;
That schalbe done anon, Mare
so myld, (295)
For the brethyng of these
bestis hath warmyd (hym)
well, i-wys.

York, Pl. 14:—

- Mary*. God will vs wisse, full
wele witt þe,
þer-fore, Joseph, be of gud chere,
For in this place borne will he be
þat sall vs saue fro sorowes sere,
boþe euen and morne.
(5)
Sir, witte þe wele þe tyme is
nere,
hee will be borne.
- Jos*. þan behoves vs bide here
stille,
here in þis same place all
þis nyght.
- Joseph* goes out after fuel.
(7-12). The child is born.
Mary worships and *Joseph*, out-
side, complains of the cold.
- Joseph* entering worships.
Nowe welcome, floure fairest of
hewe,
I shall þe menske with mayne
and myght.
- They put the child in the man-
ger and say the beasts worship
him. (17-19)
Mary. To halde hym warme þei
are full fayne (19)
with þare warme breth,
Joseph and *Mary* worship.

Compare this last with true Cov., 65, 13:—

Jos. All olde men, insampull take be me!

As so-called Coventry does not contain the story of Joseph's marriage, it must have been borrowed, either from the true Coventry or else from another play, before this story was added. It makes more evident the fact that the story is a late addition to the play. I have already shown that the differing treatment of the *Puellae* incident would indicate different editors in T and Y; that one was independent of the other as far as this addition was concerned.

This discussion has developed the fact that here also the scenes in the three cycles respond to the test we have set. There was developed in the discussion a common fundamental framework or basis upon which many additions and variations have been made. The plan of this framework is indicated by certain similar phrases without any common rhymes except in one instance. Even here the common rhyme is probably accidental, as it is found in only two of the three cycles, and there with a distorted meaning in one.

In this scene the construction of the Chester cycle begins to differ from Y, T, and true Cov., and the agreement on the part of so-called Cov. is evidently a late borrowing.

Scene 4: The Birth of Christ.

The scene of Christ's birth is missing from T, its place being taken by the first of the Wakefield Shepherd Plays. This omission is probably due to editing. The superior interest of the W plays has led to the insertion of both and the crowding out of the birth. A similar condition

of affairs exists in the Passion Group. In T the second trial before Pilate follows directly after the trial before Caiaphas. In Y three scenes, The Dream of Pilate's Wife, Jesus before Pilate, Trial before Herod, intervene between Caiaphas and Pilate II. The trial before Caiaphas in T and the first scene of the Second Trial before Pilate are in the meter peculiar to the Wakefield plays. This is evidently another place where the superior interest of these W scenes has crowded out other less interesting matter. In Coventry and Y there is much confusion in the birth scenes, but even here the general plan of the original can be traced. On page 431 it was noted that the Shepherd and Birth scenes in Cov. were confused; each divided into two scenes, the birth alternating with the Shepherds. In the other cycles, where each scene is a play by itself, this would be impossible. If however, we consider the two birth scenes and the two shepherd scenes in Cov. together, in relation to the Shepherd and Birth plays in the other cycles, their fundamental similarity becomes apparent. Benedictbeuern covers the scene with a rubric: "Deinde Maria vadet in lectum suum quae iam de spiritu sancto concepit, et pariat filium. Cui assideat Joseph in habitu honesto et proluxa barba: Nato puero, appareat stella et incipiat Chorus hanc antiphonarum. 'Hodie Christus Natus est.'" Then follows the *Stella* proper.

The points of correspondence between York and Cov. are obvious:—

1. Mary gives her reason for desiring to stop.
2. Joseph says they will stop where they are.
3. Joseph goes out.
4. The babe is born.
5. Joseph comes in and worships.
6. The incident of the warming by the breath of the cattle.

It must be noticed, however, that when Joseph goes out, he does not go for the same purpose in both plays: in Cov. it is to get help; in Y, to get fuel for a fire. In the comparison, the probability that Cov. originally agreed with Y is noted, and the scene is compared with the same in Chester. There Joseph goes out for help and brings back two midwives. Here he goes out for help and brings back none. There is no further reference to bringing help in the play. But there is reference to the cold in the last scene, when Joseph has returned. On the other hand, in Y there is no reference to midwives; but the cold is made a motive, leading to the tender scene where the cattle, warming the baby with their breath, are said to worship him. It is also referred to by Joseph when without. There he complains of the bitter cold. This, it seems to me, must have been the original motive in Cov. as well. In that last scene, it is true that in Cov. the babe is held in Joseph's arms, while in York it is put into the manger. But there is a hint in Cov. that there also the child was originally in the manger. After the quotation from Coventry given as 5 in the comparison, Joseph says:—

Josoff. Now, in my narmys I schall hym fold,
 Kyng of all kyngis be fyld and be fyrth;
 He myght haue had bettur, and himselfe wold,
 Than the breythyng of these bestis to warme hym with.

This might be taken to indicate that Joseph lifted the babe from the manger. The basis of the scene is evidently the same as in Y.

I take it, then, that in this instance Y is in many particulars closer to the original source than Coventry, which shows evidence of editing, at least in the particular of Joseph's departure to seek help. The fundamental like-

ness between the two scenes is further illustrated by the similar, though not identical, phraseology of sections 1, 2, 4, 5 in the comparison. Chester and the so-called Cov. have quite a different development.

Scene 5: The Shepherds.

This scene appears in each cycle: in T twice, with different development in each case. I use for comparison the Fleury Magi noted above and the first, the simpler, of the T plays. The Fleury play is evidently not the basis of the cyclic play; in fact, it can be taken as nothing more than an illustration of a liturgical Shepherd for comparison with the others. It introduces Herod at the first because the Stella is simply a scene of the Magi, in which Herod figures. In 2 of Fleury, the Shepherds show amazement as in the cycles, but in 4 is introduced a scene with the Obstetrices, not in the cycles. Nor is the close the same.

Of the cyclic plays, we know that T is a late play in its present form, since it is by the W editor. He has made the play appear, at first sight, very different from the others by the interest he has shown in developing the first scenes where the shepherds feast; but there are various things which indicate that the whole was written on the basis of an older play similar to York and Cov. It is of interest here, as formerly, to note the variations brought out by the comparisons:—

1. In 1 of the comparison, T and Cov. agree. Y differs.
2. In 2 Cov. and Y, as the quotations indicate, agree. T differs.
3. In 4 all agree; but Y and T more closely than Cov.
4. In 5 Cov. and T agree. Y differs.

Here we have the same phenomenon witnessed before.

The variations are not confined to one cycle, but run Y, T, Cov., Y. The agreement of T, when we know it is an editor's work, is remarkable and can be accounted for only in the way I have indicated; namely, that he must have re-written an older play, enlarging it in the special shepherd scene. That he did the same with play 13, using the same basis, is evident on analysis:—

1. The first shepherd comes on complaining. The others meet him and the Mak episode takes place. This part of the play is very elaborate, extending through the first seventy stanzas.
2. Having punished Mak, the shepherds rest. St. 71.
3. Bidden to rise by the Angel's song,

Ryse, hyrd men heynd!/ for now is he borne (72)
That shall take fro the feynd/ that adam had lorne:

4. Following a star (here the prophecies come in),

That betokyns yond starne. (73)
let vs seke hym there,

they worship, giving simple gifts.

5. *Mary.* he (Jesus) kepe you fro wo!
I shall pray hym so;
Tell furth as ye go,
And myn on this morne.

There is one variation common to all the cycles, but not occurring in the same place in each: a number of quotations are introduced from the prophets. In Y these are at the beginning; in Cov., when the shepherds see the star in the sky; and in both of T, on the way to Bethlehem. Whether this is a variation which has crept into each play separately, or a scene common to all independently shifted in each, I am not able to say. The general order of the original is apparent. The play opened with

the meeting of the shepherds and their sitting down to feast and then to sleep. Then the angel host appeared and the shepherds were terrified. Again the angels appeared, singing the *Gloria*, and spoke the "Noli timere" (See Fleury Magi). At this the shepherds went to Bethlehem, following a star, and worshipped. On their leaving, Mary blessed them. On this scheme the variations have been grafted. York deleted the feast of the shepherds and put the prophecies there. T developed the feast into an elaborate farce in each play. Confusion crept in between the appearance of the angel and that of the star (See Cov. and Y). And the prophecy was inserted in Cov. and T wherever it seemed to fit the best.

Similarity in phraseology, while not extensive, serves to mark the plan of the framework; and from this it appears that the T plays are a re-writing of the older transitional form by the W man.

Scene 6: The Magi.

In the comparison of this scene the liturgical Magi used is that of Fleury, only parts of which are taken, as it differs from the cyclic play in certain particulars. First, the presence of the shepherd scene, as a scene in the Magi itself, causes the omission of Herod's vaunting speeches at the beginning and gives the opportunity for the Magi to meet the shepherds on their way back from Bethlehem to their flocks. Another incident peculiar to the Magi is the introduction of the obstetrices. Otherwise the Fleury play is very similar to the cyclic plays, although when Herod talks to the Magi a speech by his son is introduced. But the lack of resemblance in the Fleury play only emphasizes the resemblance between the cyclic plays. In this particular scene, however, only resemblance in

Coventry

Fleury Magi (In parts)

Pastores precedes this scene.

1. Herod
to prod
on all
(475-52)

The Magi meet and greet each other.
Then: Eamus ergo et inquiramus
eum, etc.

3. Herod
Mess. i

Quibus visis, Herodes mittet ad eos
Armigerum. He inquires who they
may be as do interpreters.

And an

4. Herod
kings

Herodes mittens Armigerum pro
magis.

5. Messen
mands.

Arm. Regia vos mandata vocant,
non segnitur ite.

6. Herod
their
dismiss
turn

Agrees in general with T. Herod
talks with kings; consults scribes
and rages. His son speaks. He or-
ders kings to return to him.

7. The
is and
Yonder
Where
There
Int

Magi. Ecce stella in Oriente praevia,
etc. (Here shepherds and
Magi meet.)

8. The
(699-)

Admitted by obstetrices the Magi
make their offerings.

9. The
Herod

Istis factis, Magi incipiat dormire
ubi ante praesepe.

10. They
(725)

donec angelus moneat in somnis ut
redeant in regionem suam per aliam
viam, dicans, etc.

:
e
t
i
e
t
t
t
t
p
E
d
o
L

general development is found. In the ten divisions of the comparison only two, 3 and 7, show similarity of phrase, and these are not so close as in some other scenes. But the similarity in structure is marked, and here, as in the preceding cases where there is variation in any division, the variation exists only in one cycle. Nor are the variations in every case in the same cycle. In division one, where there is an apparent difference between the three, it is only apparent. Each editor has developed in his own way Herod's demand that the messenger go out and discover all who are disaffected toward him. The general meaning is the same in each case. In 4 and 5 Cov. and T agree, Y differs. The difference in 5 is a logical development of that in 4. In 6 Y and T agree in having quotations from the prophets which are not in Cov. In Y the Kings, and in T the Councillors quote the prophets; but variations in actors, to whom lines are assigned, are not of value enough to be noticed, since they may easily be changed at the whim of an editor. In every other respect the plays agree in their development in the three cycles.

This is the second of the plays in which Hohlfeld thought he had discovered a certain number of parallel passages in T and Y, as well as a "general imitation." But the parallelism in this play seems to be either purely accidental or else the result of late borrowing. St. 100 of the T play is without doubt a direct quotation of Y, pl. 17, st. 27. But such a direct quotation must be a very much later addition to the cycle than any similar passages that might have come down by way of translation from liturgical times. It presupposes full development in the Y play before quotation is possible; and full development means growth into the Final Period. It seems best, therefore, to consider this to be a borrowing made

at the time of the other direct borrowings from Y. It contains the Angel's warning to the sleeping Magi, and might easily have been inserted in place of a similar T stanza.

Another passage which Hohlfeld considers decidedly similar to Y is that in which Balaam's prophecy is cited.¹ It probably arose through separate use of the same scripture by the T and Y editors, as it occurs in T in the conversation the Magi have at their meeting, but in Y at the point in the conversation with Herod where the kings quote the prophets to him. The similarity is marked, but not more extensive than would arise from the use of common scripture by different editors. T. (st. 35) runs:—

Certan, balaam spekys of this thyng,
That of Iacob a starne shall spryng
That shall overcome kasar and kyng,
Withoutten stryfe;
All folk shalbe to hym obeyng
That berys the lyfe.

Y is as follows (pl. 17, st. 14):—

Sir, the thar meruayle no-thing,
Of þis ilke nott þat þus-gate newes,
For Balaam saide a starne shulde spring
Of Jacob kynde, and þat is Jewes.

The scripture is Numbers xxiv, 17: "There shall come forth a star out of Jacob," etc. These must be considered simply independent quotations of the same prophecy.

A second similarity Hohlfeld thinks to exist in the exclamation of Herod, Y, st. 11: "Kyng! in þe dewyl way, dogges, Fy!"; and T, 49: "we fy! fy! dewyls on thame all thre!"; or 48: "King! the dewill! bot of what em-

¹ *Anglia* xi, p. 293.

York, Pl. 18.

line.

37. Wakyn, Joseph! an
tente!
40. þar-fore I bidde þ
mare.
41. A! myghtfull lorde,
that mente?
42. So swete a voyce he
ayre.
51. For I am sente to
52. Gabriell, goddis aun
55. For Horowde the ky
to dede
56. All knave childer
58. with þeris twa
59. þat are of olde.
62. Tille I witte the for
84. Marie, my daughter
86. A! leue Joseph, wha
105. I durk, I dare,
106. Whoo may my car
107. Of balis blynne?
139-41. His harte aught
sare,
On slike a food
for-fare,
þat nevir did ill.
160. Do tyte, pakke same
206. Allas! Joseph for w
208. Was neuer wight in
will!
193. Joseph, full woo is n
229. Fare wele and haue

Freising.

Ang. Joseph, Joseph surge; Josepl
in Aegyptum cum matre feras citu
Christum.

Ne cum mactandis pueris rex mactet
et ipsum

Admonitus redeas ubi nex fraus rex-
que quiescit.

Joseph. Angelus a patria nos prae-
cipe ire, maria;

Rex fugiendi erit, Puerum qui per-
dere quaerit.

Maria. Omnia dura pati vitando
pericula nati

Mater sum praesto; jam vidam tu
comes esto.

Jos. pergans in Aegyptum.

¹ Comparison of Y and

pyre!" But this can only have been an accidental similarity in curses.

It must be considered, then, that in this play in the three cycles we have a fundamental similarity in framework. This has made it easy for the York editor of T to replace an older T stanza by the corresponding one from York.

Scene 7: The Flight into Egypt.

The Flight into Egypt is the third and last scene in which Hohlfeld notes a borrowing of isolated phrases along with a general imitation of Y by T. So marked is this similarity in phrase that I have quoted my comparison of Y and T from Hohlfeld's authority, O. Hertich, *Studien zu den York Plays*. It is at once apparent that the similar phrases are much more numerous than would be the case if they were simply tags or catchwords remaining from the liturgical episodes, such as have been discovered in other scenes. Furthermore, a number of these phrases contain rhymes common to the two cycles. There are at least four of these: Y, *entent, nomare*; T, *intent, nomare*; Y, *dere, chere*; T, *dere, chere*; Y, *sare, fare, yll*; T, *sare, fare, yll*; Y, *woo, wyll*; T, *wo, wyll*. On page 426 attention was called to the fact that the presence of common rhymes in any number would make possible only one conclusion: the plays containing these rhymes must have been taken from a common source already translated into English, that is, already transitional in nature. This must be the conclusion here.

It is no surprise, then, to find Cov. entirely different from Y and T. The comparison contains the whole scene, which is an episode in the long scene of the Innocents, after the soldiers have been sent to Bethlehem and just

before the slaughter. This is the position of the scene in the play from Freising, quoted as the liturgical example, where it is very similar to Coventry. The only possible conclusion is that in Cov. we have the play in almost its liturgical form, while T and Y have inserted another more elaborate scene. This was transitional in its nature. When the insertion took place cannot be told. It may have caused the change in the position of the scene, making it a separate play before the Innocents, as a scene of such length could not easily have been incorporated into that play. Evidently neither Y borrowed from T, nor T from Y, since the characters are differently developed in the two. In Y Joseph is all sympathy and patience with Mary. His fault-finding in T is in sad contrast to this. He there says (T, st. 12):—

So wyll a wyght as I,
 In warld was neuer man;
 howsehold and husbandry
 ffullsore I may it ban;
 That bargain dere I by.
 yong men, bewar, red I;
 wedyng makys me all wan.

This diverse development could easily have taken place after the time when a common transitional source had been used; and does not make it necessary to consider that there was any contrast between Y and T during that period. It might, on the other hand, be thought, as Hohlfeld, indeed, does think,¹ that this similarity between Y and T arises from the fact that the T editor wrote the play from his remembrance of Y, incorporating such phrases as he could. But this has not been found to be the case in other plays, notably 10 and 14, in which

¹ *Anglia*, XI, 293, 307.

Coventry.

1. Messenger announces departure of Magi. (768-776)
2. Herod orders children killed. (786-792)
3. (After the Flight, 816-829). Women enter; knights kill children; women lament. (830-883)
4. The knights report to Herod who (884-900)

(In part.)

t Mess. says to Herod:
m vive! Delusus es,
per viam redierunt

er limine, pueros, fac
erire.

s, tuae, natorum par-
tae.

del illustrated by the
which differ from T,

he has supposed the same conditions to exist. Why, then, should it be more probable in this? Some color is lent to the contention, however, by the fact that st. 11 of play 1 may possibly be a memory of York. But st. 11 is in couplets, and there is no evidence that the couplet editor worked on the T play of the Flight. In fact, the meter is regular throughout. We must, then, consider the Flight in Y and T to have been derived from the same transitional source, and that Cov. alone shows the original form of the scene. The place from which this transitional source of Y and T was obtained cannot be stated.

Scene 8: The Innocents.

This is the last scene in the Coventry Shearmen and Tailors. The relationship between the three cycles, broken in the last play, is here resumed, though there are no corresponding phrases. I again compare with the Fleury Magi. This lack of correspondence in phrase is explained, as far as T is concerned, by the fact that the T play is the work of the W editor. Hohlfeld thinks¹ it one of those plays which are founded on a memory of York but contain no phrases common to both cycles. But we have already seen how in the two shepherd plays the W editor rewrote old plays. That this play is doubtless an instance of the same thing, the comparison reveals. Here, however, his work seems to have been more balanced and not confined so largely to the development of a single episode. There is only one variation from the regular outline, and that in the work of the W editor in the final episode where the knights report. The other two cycles agree and show the original purport of the scene.

¹ *Anglia*, XI, pp. 293, 307.

We have now considered all the scenes in the Christmas series to the close of those plays which, on the authority of Chambers, might have had a liturgical source. A striking correspondence in fundamental framework has developed. There remain two plays, the Purification and the Doctors, which are connected more closely with the Nativity than with any other episode in Christ's life and would naturally be closing scenes in a Christmas play. That this was the case is probable, though the evidence is not so clear as in the plays already considered. There the fact that all the scenes are found in a single Cov. play is evidence that all are to be grouped under one head; of which grouping additional evidence is brought out by the fact that we have other plays in Latin, and therefore liturgical, of about the same content. None of these plays also contains the episode of the Purification and the Doctors. Cov., it is true, has them both, but in a separate play, the Weavers' play. There are about this play, however, some things which suggest that it might have split off from the Shearmen and Tailors. One is the peculiar development which the prophetic prologue has received in Cov. Before the Magi scene a dialogue of prophets is inserted, which recounts preceding events and thus becomes a modified prophetic prologue to the scene. At this point there would otherwise have been an abrupt transition in scene from the manger in Bethlehem to Herod's palace. At such a place a break in the play might naturally occur. Turning now to the Weavers' play, we find it introduced by an exactly similar prophetic prologue. As the prologue to the Magi in Shearmen and Tailors rehearsed the story of Christ's birth and the coming of the shepherds, which were the events recorded in the preceding scenes, so the prologue to the Weavers' play rehearses the coming of the kings who followed a mys-

terious star; this all as an introduction to the story of Mary's Purification and of the Doctors. Here, then, the break in the play has evidently occurred. The Purification shows signs of considerable enlargement in Cov., and this may have been the cause of the break. It might be said in opposition to this view that the prophetic introduction to the Magi marks the beginning of a play originally separate from the Birth and Shepherds, which has later been joined to it; but it must be remembered that the tendency, as the plays grew, was for scenes to break off and form separate plays, that the single play embracing all the scenes on Christ's nativity is the earlier form. In this connection it is noteworthy that the prologue to the Weavers' play only rehearses the coming of the Magi and not all of the preceding scenes, as though it deliberately refrained from repeating the preceding prologue. This would indicate an originally organic connection. We must, then, hold the theory that originally all these plays were one and that they furnished two points of cleavage where *prophetæ* had been inserted as dialogued introductions to the Magi and Purification. At only one of these points had cleavage actually taken place; that is, between the Magi and Purification. If we consider that the T and Y cycles developed from the same source as Cov., that would account for the position of the Purification after the Innocents and before the Doctors in T. In the Y text it has been misplaced, but in Burton's list ¹ of Y (1415) it is in the same position as in T. This we may conclude to have been its original position. If now a comparison is made of the two plays in the three cycles, the Purification will be found to contain the same fundamental relationships which we have

¹ Miss L. T. Smith, *York Plays*, Introd., xxi, and note.

found in the other plays of the group, while the Doctors presents certain new characteristics in that it is in both instances a late borrowing from Y; from which both have in most places borrowed word for word. There is no liturgical nor transitional play extant with which to compare the cyclic play.

Scene 9: The Purification of Mary (T 17, Y 41).

Unfortunately the T play is a fragment, two leaves of the ms. being lost. Compared, as far as it goes, with Y, it shows the following scenes:—

- | | |
|---|--|
| Y. 1. Simeon and Anna prophesy. | T. 1. Not in T. |
| 2. Simeon bemoans his age but calls to mind the prophets and prays for life until he can see the Christ. The angels promise this. He praises God. | 2. Same as Y. At the close Simeon hears the bells calling him to the temple. |
| 3. Mary and Joseph prepare to go to the temple for the Purification. | 3. Same as in Y, but much shorter. |
| 4. Joseph and Mary offer doves. Anna welcomes the babe. | 4. Not in T. |
| 5. Angel summons Simeon to the temple. | 5. Angels summon Simeon to the temple. T breaks off. |

With the exception of the scenes with Anna, which T does not contain, the two plays have practically the same development, though there is no correspondence in phraseology. The Cov. play ¹ is much longer and more complex than either of these, but on analysis shows striking similarities to them.

¹ *Anglia*, xxv, 212.

Cov., Sc. 1, 1-174. A long *prophetæ* rehearsing events of the Magi.
 Sc. 2, 175-287. Speech by Simeon in which he calls prophets to witness that Christ will be born and prays to see that babe. A scene between Simeon and Anna seems to have been inserted into the original scene here. At line 202, after recounting the prophecies, Simeon begins his prayer that he may see the babe before he dies; ending it,

Yett, lorde, þi grace to me now extende!
 Suffur me rathur yett to lyve in peyne,
 Then to dy, or thatt I thatt solam syght haue seyne!

This corresponds to the last stanza of Simeon's prayer in T.

T, st. 9. Bot, lord, that vs thy grace has hight,
 Send me thy sond, both day and nyght,
 And graunt me grace of lyfys light,
 And let me neuer de,
 To thou sich grace to me send,
 That I may handyll hym in my hend,
 That shall cum oure mys to amend,
 And se hym with myn ee.

or Y, lines 161-164.

A! trowes thowe these ij eyes shall see
 That blyssed babb, or they be owte?
 Ye, I pray God so myght it be.
 then were I putt all owte of dowte.

In T and Y the speech of the Angels to Simeon directly follows. But in Cov. there is a long scene between Anna and Simeon, rehearsing the prophets again and closing with another prayer by Simeon after Anna goes out.

275. Now, lorde, that madist all thyng of noght,
 Both hevyn and hell and eyuere creature,
 Asse thow knoist myn inwarde thoght,
 Reycomforde (me), when hit ys thy plesure!
 Then the tyme of thy natevete
 With my mortall yeeis thatt I myght se, etc.,

ending,

Or that I unto slepe do goo,
 I commytt my warkis with all the sircumstance
 wholly unto thy lawis and ordonance.

Then follows the angel's speech. Both the scene with Anna and the second prayer seem like late insertions; where the prayer is used to make connection with the angel's speech, lines, 288-309.

Sc. 3, 310-362. Simeon and his clerics go to the temple. The bell rings as in T.

Sc. 4, 363-581. Mary and Joseph go to the temple. As in Y there is brought out the need of two doves. In Y Joseph has them, but in Cov. he is made to hunt them in a long scene full of ill managed fun, so-called. They end by going to the temple.

Sc. 5, 582-718. Angels call Simeon to the temple as in T and Y. He goes with his clerics and Anna to greet Joseph and Mary. They welcome the babe. The scene and play ends.

Three scenes are common to all three plays:—

1. A prophecy and prayer by Simeon, ending with the Angel's song.
2. Mary and Joseph take the babe to the temple.
3. Angels call Simeon and he welcomes the child.

This is all there is in T. In fact, the break occurs before Simeon has time to welcome the child. To this Y has added the scene with Simeon and Anna and Anna's welcome of the child. These two Cov. has also added, but in different places. In Y Anna is first introduced after the opening prologue and speaks a monologue detailing her career. She holds no conversation with Simeon, whose regular speech follows. Her speech appears to have been prefixed to the first scene in which Simeon appears. Her other appearance in Y is in a scene in which Joseph and Mary make their sacrifices, a scene which occurs neither in T nor in Cov. I have already noted how the first appearance of Anna in Cov. seems to be inserted in Simeon's first speech. Her second appearance as well is managed otherwise than in York, for here she comes in with Simeon and his clerics.

These scenes in Cov. in which Simeon appears with Clerics are a development found in no other cycle. In a similar way this cycle alone gives a humorous cast to the scene in which Mary and Joseph prepare to go to Jeru-

saalem, and thus lowers, to a great extent, the tone of the play. Considering all these things, I am inclined to think that we have in T a remnant of the play which is nearer the original form than are the others; that the three scenes in T which are the only three common to the three cycles constituted the three of the original play, to which Y and Cov. made independent additions of the character of Anna. That these were independent is proved by the fact that Anna's speeches are introduced at different places in the two cycles and do not correspond to each other. That Cov. introduced the device of the clerics at the same time that the character of Anna was introduced is proved by the fact that Anna's second appearance is an essential part of the appearance of Simeon and his clerics. Says Simeon, lines 620 ff.:—

Then, Surs, cum forthe (with me) apase,
 And myrrele the bellis ryng!
 An(n)e systur, goo ye (alse) with me,
 For to reyseyve thatt prince of (h)onowre,
 And hym to welcum reuerently,
 Ase of this world lorde and governowre!

We have thus determined that in the case of the Purification the same fundamental similarity between the cycles exists which we have discovered in connection with the preceding plays. This is an additional proof that it was a part of the original liturgical play from which the Nativity scenes of the cycle have sprung, and that our theory of cleavage in Cov. is correct. It further offers a solution of the difficulty arising from the fact that the Purification is out of the right chronological order in T as well as in Y. Its position in T is that which it had occupied since liturgical times.

Scene 10: The Doctors.

The connection in the Coventry cycle between this play and the Purification, as well as the fact that it is the only play on Christ's boyhood, would lead us to place it among the Christmas plays. Unfortunately we have no further direct evidence to bear this out, as the play as it now stands in both Cov. and T. is evidently a direct borrowing from Y. In T the borrowing is almost word for word. In Cov. it has undergone considerable editing. It is evident at once that such a word for word borrowing could only have taken place late in the cycle's growth, because it is only late in its growth that a cyclic play reaches its full development. We must conclude, on this account, that, whatever basis of comparison between the cycles may have existed, none exists now; that is, no direct basis. Indirectly we may come to some conclusion. It is reasonable to suppose that the late Y borrowings, whenever they are only portions of plays as the plays now exist, have replaced older scenes along the same lines that already existed in the T cycle. Otherwise it would have been impossible to adjust these new scenes to the old plays as well as has been done in most cases. Therefore, the very presence of this borrowing from Y is an indication that it has, in both T and Cov., simply replaced older scenes along the same lines and that the whole was a part of the Nativity in the liturgical source of these cycles.

In the light of this analysis it seems probable that the Christmas Groups in T, Y, and true Cov. grew out of the same liturgical source. The similarity in framework which runs through the series in the three cycles shows them closely bound together. With such a similarity it becomes practically certain that the prophetic prologue

was part of the liturgical source, especially when we remember that no Old Testament plays developed in Cov. and that there is no fundamental similarity in the Old Testament plays in T and Y. This liturgical source was more extensive than any extant liturgical play. Besides the Annunciation-Innocents series it contained scenes on the Purification and the Doctors. York is the only one of the cycles which retains all of the scenes. The Birth is lost from T and the Salutation from Cov. The loss of the birth scene from T is due to editorial revision. The greater interest of the two shepherds' scenes by the W editor has crowded it out. The loss of the Salutation from Cov. must also be laid to an editor, as Cov. was largely re-edited and as the T and Y plays show no marked evidence of a Transitional source. In one case, that of the Flight into Egypt, Cov. alone retains the original form. Both T and Y have evidently inserted a scene from a Transitional source. In T there is evidence, in plays 12, 13, and 16, that the W editor has simply re-written older plays already in the cycle.

This conclusion is emphasized by a comparison with the Chester¹ Cycle, which shows marked dissimilarity in framework. The Chester Nativity opens with an Annunciation without the Prologue of Prophets. This is followed by an extended Salutation, which is without the inquiry concerning the kin, and ends with Elizabeth's leading Mary to Joseph. The account of Joseph's trouble is merely an incident. The Birth introduces a disgusting scene with the midwives and in itself forms merely an episode in a long scene between the Emperor Octavian, his councillors, and the Sibyl. The councillors wish to deify the Emperor, who consults the Sibyl. She prophe-

¹ T. Wright, *The Chester Plays*.

sies Christ's birth, and after it has occurred announces the event to Octavian. He thereupon refuses deification. The Pastores differs from T, Y, and Cov. in a scene in which the shepherds make fun of Joseph, who explains at length his relationship to Mary. In general the Magi follows the lines of T, Y, and Cov. though much, if not all, of the detail is very different. It introduces Joseph again, explaining his relationship to Mary. The angel warns the Magi while they are awake. The Innocents differs considerably from T, Y, and Cov. Herod calls his knights together, and they boast at great length before going out to slay the children. The astonishing climax comes, when it develops that a child of Herod's has been slain in the massacre. Naturally he is displeased. The play ends with his death, for a Demon comes to carry him to hell. Then the Angel comes to Joseph in Egypt and tells him to return.

It is not necessary to carry this comparison further. It is evident that Chester could not have been developed from the same liturgical source from which T, Y, and true Cov. are derived. So-called Coventry differs even more, introducing a number of additional scenes connected with Mary's birth, etc. The divergences in these two cycles but emphasize the similarities in the other three.

THE RESURRECTION PLAYS.

In regard to the Resurrection Plays it is not possible to make quite so definite an assertion of the probability of a liturgical source as was possible with the Christmas plays. A statement of the points of comparison reveals a similarity; but it is hardly so evident as in the preceding series. Of course the probability in the Christmas series increases the probability in the Resurrection plays.

1. v. 11. Maria autem stabat
monumentum foris, plorans;
ergo fleret, inclinavit se, et
pexit in monumentum. 13. Say me, garthy-
v. 12. Et vidit duos angelos I the pray,
albis, sedentes unum ad eum I caught my lord away;
et unum ad pedes, ubi pos: sothe, say me not
fuerat corpus Iesu.
2. v. 13. Dicunt ei illi: Mulier, & he lyys,
ploras? Dicit eis: Quia tulc: meue hym if I may,
Dominum meum; et nescio: wise.
posuerunt eum. Woman, why wepie
be still!
3. v. 14. Haec cum dixisset, thou?
versa est retrorsum et vidi:
sum stantem; et non sciebat
Iesus est.
- v. 15. Dicit ei Iesus: M:
quid ploras? quem quaeris for my lord I lyke
ll;
4. Illa existimans quia hortu: bare his body tyll
esset, dicit ei; Domine, si tu he pray;
tulisti eum, dicito mihi ubi I may,
suisti eum; et ego eum tolla: te with me,
lyng day/
5. v. 16. Dicit ei Iesus: Mari: huld I be.
6. Conversa illa, dicit ei; Ra:
(quod dicitur magister).
7. v. 17. Dicit ei Iesus: Noli sekys thy god,
tangere, nondum eum ad P: am I.
meum.
8. Not in Vulgate.
9. vade autem ad fratres meos
dic eis: Ascendo ad P: er, tell I the,
meum, et Patrem vestrum, I noght;
meum, et Deum vestrum.
10. v. 18. Venit Maria Mag:
annuncians discipulis: Quia
Dominum, et haec dixit m:

sends Mary to tell
that she has seen.

Without the similarity in the Christmas series it would be possible to draw no conclusions concerning the Resurrection series; with that similarity, it is possible to assume a probable liturgic source for this group. However, the comparison is made more uncertain by the fact that we have no text of Coventry, though the Cov. lists contain a reference to a Resurrection and a 1540 Castle of Emmaus.¹ The scenes included by Chambers in the typical liturgical Resurrection play all appear in T and Y: T, plays 26-28; Y, plays 38-40, 42 inclusive.

Pl. Y.	Pl. T.
38. The Resurrection.	26. The Resurrection.
39. Jesus appears to Mary.	26. Jesus appears to Mary.
40. The Visit to Emmaus.	27. The Visit to Emmaus.
42. The Incredulity of Thomas.	28. The Incredulity of Thomas.

Unfortunately the Resurrection scene in T is borrowed directly from Y at a late date and comparison is, therefore, impossible. But in the remaining scenes the comparison shows a common fundamental framework, as in the Christmas group.

The first unborrowed scene is the Appearance of Christ to Mary. The Y play is much the longer and more elaborate of the two. As it does not belong to the parent cycle, or oldest stratum of Y,² it has probably been rewritten. While Y and T have the same biblical source, it is possible to establish a somewhat closer connection between them than this alone would allow. The biblical source is: John xx, 11-12; Matt. xxviii, 10. I have inserted in the comparison the Vulgate and a part of a Prague Resurrection Play³ containing this scene.

¹ Chambers, vol. 2, App. x, p. 423.

² Davidson, pp. 137-157.

³ C. Lange, *Die Lateinischen Osterfeiern*, p. 146.

The first scene, based on John xx, 11, is not in T. This can be explained as the result of editing; for the connection between sc. 1 and sc. 2 of T, play 26, is very abrupt. Pilate says, line 561,

The blyssyng of mahowne be with you nyght and day,

and 562 is the

Say me, garthynere, I the pray,

of Mary. The second episode is missing from Y. In the Vulgate the angels first ask Mary why she weeps, and she replies that it is because they have borne away her Lord. In Prague she makes that statement after looking into the tomb, without the angels' question. In T she addresses the gardener with the demand of John xx, 15, which is later repeated in its proper place. In John xx, 15, Jesus asks the same question, "Quid ploras?" which the angels ask in verse 13. Confusion of the replies is evident in T. It is not impossible that Y originally contained a similar speech by Mary. Christ appears as gardener in st. 4. St. 3, which should contain this speech, is defective, as it has only five lines. As Mary's first speech in T is repeated a few lines further down, it would not be unnatural to suppose that these missing lines in Y were originally similar to the T lines and were dropped because the same thought was expressed in its correct position a few lines below in st. 6. That st. 3 is a defective stanza is proved by comparison with other stanzas in the play. The normal stanza rhymes *ababab*; but stanzas 6 and 7 are twelve-lined, rhyming *ababcdcdcdcd* and *ababababcdcd* respectively. It might be thought, then, that st. 3 was really part of st. 2, making that stanza like 6 and 7, did it not contain five lines, rhyming *ababa*,

instead of four, and thus show that it is really irregular, being without the last *bab* rhymes. The third episode is common to all four. Y and T vary from the Vulgate in compressing all verse 14 and clause 2 of 15 into a stage direction (implied at least). In this way they agree with Prague. This similarity with Prague, rather than with scripture, is continued in the fourth episode. In the fifth, Y and T each has its own enlargement of the Vulgate and liturgical "Maria!" In the sixth episode the liturgical play has inserted a stage direction, "Et illa inclinando." It may be that T, st. 98, is a development of a similar rubric.

Maria Magdalene: Rabony, my lord so dere!
 Now am I hole that thou art here,
 Suffer me to negh the nere,
 And kys thi feete;
 Myght I do so, so well me were,
 ffor thou art swete.

The seventh episode has a similar direction in the Prague play. The eighth is peculiar to Y alone. It is allegorical in its nature and evidently a later insertion. The tenth is not found in Y or T.

The scene is a good illustration of the fact that Y and T, though dependent on the same biblical source, are not dependent upon that alone, but have in common certain fundamental characteristics, which indicate that they sprang from the same liturgical source. It also illustrates the different ways in which even a liturgical play, although following the biblical source closely, may yet vary from it in certain particulars.

The next scene is the Visit to Emmaus, Luke, xxiv, 13-33. In both cycles it follows the account of the Vulgate, with certain distinctive similarities such as were illustrated in the scene above.

1. Y, st. 1-8; T, st. 1-16. The two disciples, meeting, lament over Christ's death. They recall his tortures and feel their own sorrows to be ever fresh. They rehearse the events of his crucifixion. Luke xxiv, 14: "Et ipsi loquebantur ad invicem de his omnibus quae acciderunt."
2. Y, st. 9-16; T, st. 17-33. Jesus meets them; inquires their trouble. They express surprise that he has not learned of the events of the last few days, which they recount. Luke xxiv, 15-25.
3. Y, st. 17-18; T, st. 34-37. Christ reproaches them and recounts the prophecies. Luke xxiv, 26, 27.
4. Y, st. 19, 20; T, st. 38-46. They invite Him to stay with them. They sit down to eat. He blesses the food and vanishes. Luke xxiv, 28-32.
5. Y st. 28-29; T st. 47-62. The two recognize Him. Wondering, they rejoice that they have seen the risen Lord. They go tell the disciples.

It is not probable that the extensive similarity in the first episode, a similarity more or less characteristic of the others, could have arisen from the Bible verse quoted. There must have been some other source, as the similarity is only one of structure and does not include parallel phraseology extending to common rhymes. Whatever similarity in wording there is can be explained as the separate translation of a common liturgical source.

The last scene is the Incredulity of Thomas: T, pl. 28; Y, pl. 42. This play is much longer in T than in Y. In T it opens with a portion of a scene in which John and Peter prepare to run to the sepulchre according to John xx, 3-10. But an editor has changed John to Paul in order to have this part agree with the Thomas scene which follows. There Paul and not John figures. The first scene is not in Y. This may possibly be explained by the fact that all the resurrection plays in Y have been re-edited—that is, are not part of the parent cycle.¹ So this

¹ Davidson, pp. 137-157.

may have been dropped. It is known that the Y cycle once contained six more plays than are present in the extant manuscript.¹ Or, it may be a late addition to T. But it is only the introduction to what was, apparently, a play of considerable length, and one can see no reason for deliberately borrowing this introduction from outside to prefix to a wholly different scene. It seems more logical to consider its presence as the result of a bungling attempt to condense two already existing T scenes into one, especially as the Thomas scene has been entirely rewritten by the quatrain editor. This would make it a late revision. The presence in the liturgy of the scene where Peter and John run to the sepulchre is so well established that it would be more natural than otherwise to consider that it was originally present in the liturgical source of T and Y and has been lost or condensed, as indicated above.²

The following analysis of the Thomas scene will do equally well for both T and Y:—

¹See Burton's list, *York Plays*, Introduction, especially p. xxviii.

²Note in this connection the following more highly developed scene from Augsburg, 11th or 12th century (Lange, 182). I quote simply this scene from a longer play:—

Eæ post intervallum stantes in medio, linteum in publicium ostendes canent:

Cernitis socii

Tunc duo ad hoc parati, ex persona discipulorum petri et iohannis, et currendo ad monumentum vnus precedat, quo non intrante, posterior introeat choro cantent a:

Currebant duo simul

Interum sacerdotes predicti: cruce undata aspersa et thurifecta, pronuntient omnibus resurrectionem cantando a

Surrexit dominus de sepulchro.

Chorus autem, audita resurrectiones, prorumpens in gaudium, alta voce communiter imponet:

Te deum laudamus.

1. T, st. 12-18; Y, st. 1-5. The assembled disciples mourn. Christ appears and vanishes.
2. T, st. 19-37; Y, st. 6-16. Christ reappears; discourses with the disciples; is given food, a honey-comb and roasted fish, which He blesses and breaks and eats before them. Then He exhorts them in closing (In T certain disciples finish the scene with conversation).
3. T, st. 38-40; Y, st. 17-20. Thomas, without, mourns over Christ's death.
4. T, st. 40-73; Y, st. 21-28. Thomas enters and listens, incredulous, when the disciples say they have seen Jesus. They try to convince him.
5. T, st. 73-84; Y, st. 29-33. Christ appears again and calls on Thomas to touch Him. Thomas asks grace of Him and the scene closes with a paraphrase of John, xx, 29. "Dixit ei Jesus Quia vidisti me Thoma, Credisti: beati, qui non viderunt et crediderunt."

The scenes both have the same sources and combine them in the same manner. The first part of each, until episode 3, is from Luke, xxiv, 36-43. Episode 2 ends, however, with John, xx, 23. Episode 3 is not in the biblical account. Four and 5 follow the account in John, xx, 24-29.

In the first episode in both cycles Christ appears and vanishes after the "Pax vobis," appearing again in episode 2. Neither biblical source gives two appearances, though John xx, 21 repeats the "Pax vobis." Here and in episode 3 the scenes show a common fundamental divergence from the biblical account. It happens that the Chester Thomas scenes (Ch, pl. 20, Wright's edition, vol. 2, pp. 108-112) have the same sources but have not the two entrances by Christ; nor have they the scene in which Thomas mourns without. This emphasizes the resemblance between T and Y. But this resemblance includes no common phraseology, except such as may be accounted for by separate translation of a common biblical source. It is above all a resemblance in fundamental framework.

In the light of these facts I am inclined to assume for

T, Y, and Cov. a common liturgic source in the Christmas series, and the same for T and Y in the Resurrection series. From whence this source is derived I cannot say, though the natural assumption would be from the Use of York. The Beverley list¹ bears out this assumption as far as a mere list may; for it contains, allowing for different grouping of some scenes, all the scenes of these liturgical plays. Beverley and Wakefield are near to York and would naturally follow that Use. Coventry, on the other hand, is at some distance from York, and I have been able to discover no indication, either that it ever followed the Use of York, or that it might not have done so. Unluckily there is no record of such liturgical plays in the York service. There are certain indirect references in the Missal (date 1509), which Davidson² thinks refer to the acting of liturgical plays, written down outside the Missal itself. With this idea I have no quarrel further than to say that these could hardly have been the old plays out of which the cycle developed. The Missal as we have it is later than the Final period. The drama grew away from the liturgy as well as out of it, and in its growth would have taken with it all the liturgical scenes. They could not have grown into cyclic plays and still be left in the liturgy. There must, rather, have been a period, about the time of the complete secularization of the plays, when the York liturgy contained no drama. This would also coincide with the period of reaction against drama within the church, so that when additions were afterwards made to the liturgy, they would be of the simplest nature. Thus we find left in the Missal the elaborate ceremony of the Adoration of the Cross,³ which

¹ Chambers, vol. 2, pp. 340, 341.

² Davidson, pp. 18, 19.

³ *York Missal*, pp. 105-106.

never received dramatic development, though so closely connected with the Easter Service. But the Visit of the Maries is compressed into the *Victimi Paschali*¹ sung simply as a Sequence without dramatization. Thus it is impossible to take the Missal as any indication of what plays originally grew up in Y. Nor is there any evidence outside of this common liturgical source to prove that the Use of York was ever followed in Coventry, during the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. So the fact that the source may have been the Use of York remains simply a conjecture.

In addition to the plays herein discussed, the Towneley Cycle contains a well developed Passion Group, which has been subjected to most elaborate re-editing at various times; a series of Old Testament plays; a few plays on Christ's ministry; a play called The Talents and one on the Harrowing of Hell, between the Passion and the Resurrection Groups; and two, one on the Ascension, and the other on the Judgment; all of which must, according to a strict following of Chambers's theory, be classed as transitional. In connection with these it is enough for the present to say that many of the difficulties with respect to the plays of the Passion Group are best explained by considering them to have been derived, in common with York, from some late liturgical Passion play. It is within this group that the remaining plays, in which Hohlfeld traces a general imitation of Y by T, are found. There are no similarities in rhymes which would lead us to think such a Passion play transitional. This late liturgical origin is borne out by the fact that the T, Y, Cov. liturgic Christmas play must have been a late one because of its great length. But consideration of these questions

¹ *York Missal*, p. 129.

concerning the T Passion play must be postponed until some future time. Nor is this the time to discuss the Ascension and the Judgment, themselves apparently late liturgic in origin. It is sufficient at present to say of the Old Testament plays and the Ministry plays that they are so markedly distinct in framework from similar plays in York as to indicate their transitional origin and to emphasize the similarity in the Christmas and Resurrection Groups. But all these matters may well be the subjects of future discussion and analysis.

F. W. CADY.

XVII.—THE FAMILY OF MAURICE SCÈVE.

One of the earliest members of the important Scève family at Lyons was Henri Scève, great-grandfather of Maurice Scève,¹ the leading poet of the Lyonnese renaissance. Henri, who was still living in 1471,² seems to have had two sons, François and Léonard. Of François, the younger of these sons, we learn that about 1480 he suffered considerable damage *à la barre du pont du Rosne tant pour la mortalité, gens d'armes, que pour les grans eaues.*³

In 1493, he possessed *des prés et des terres labourables* in the parish of Vaise. Ten years later (1503), he and his son were proprietors of the inn Ste-Catherine, which, however, was *maloustru et mal prouffitant.*⁴

Léonard Scève, who was probably the eldest of the children of Henri, was born in 1425. He married Jeannette Lanczot, or Lançot, the daughter of a notary whose office he inherited.⁵ Furthermore, he received from his wife's dowry a house for which he was taxed 5 *sous* in 1455.⁶ Léonard died in 1468 and left a number of children, among whom were the sons Maurice, Pierre, Jean, Michel, and Barthélemy, and the daughters Ancelis, who married Antoine de Ladoi, Jeanne, who married Michel Vignat, and Pernelle, of whom we shall speak later.⁷

¹ In his excellent work on *Maurice Scève et la Renaissance lyonnaise* (Paris, Champion, 1906), M. Baur has failed to supply any new information concerning the family of the poet. For that reason it is hoped that the following notes may be of interest. Compare also my review of the above work in the *Mod. Lang. Notes* (November, 1908, pp. 229-231).

² *Archives communales de Lyon*, CC 90.

³ *Ibid.*, CC 480.

⁴ CC 18 and 110.

⁵ *Bibl. nat., Cabinet de Titres, Cabinet de d'Hozier*, 311.

⁶ *Arch. com.*, CC 74.

⁷ *Cab. de Titres, Pièces originales*, 2698.

Of Maurice Scève, the father of the poet, we learn that in 1493 he and his mother possessed each *la tierce partie d'une maison haulte, moyenne et basse, avec ung jardin en la rue de Bourgneuf*. In 1496, he and his brothers were taxed 20 *livres*; and four years later, they advanced a large sum for the reception of the queen who was soon to visit the city.¹ Having received the degree of doctor of laws, Maurice Scève père, was appointed *juge-mage* of Lyons, a charge that he held until 1517. He was elected *échevin* of Lyons in 1503, and again in 1505–06, 1508, and 1510–11.² In 1506, he was selected by the city officials to deliver the doctoral oration on the day of St-Thomas. When the newly elected *échevins* were received into their offices, some distinguished scholar, usually a Lyonnese, was chosen to deliver an oration in Latin in honor of the event. Two years before this, the orator selected was Symphorien Champier, the celebrated physician.³

During the next few years, there is no further mention of Maurice Scève père, save in the tax-receipts.⁴ In the month of January, 1515, Pierre Renouard, Claude Gravier, secretary of the Consulate, and Maurice Scève père, were sent by the *échevins* of Lyons *vers le roy François I^{er} de ce nom, nouvellement venu à la couronne pour faire le serment de fidélité de la ville*. These envoys were allowed 103 *livres* to pay the expenses of the trip.⁵

From a document of the same year (1515), we learn that Maurice Scève père, and his wife, Claude Pacot, possessed considerable property at Lyons, Ecully, and Anse. Three

¹Arch. com., CC 4 ; 532 ; and 541.

²Ibid., BB 370 ; CC 568 and 598.

³BB 377 ; cf. also *Les Oraisons doctorales de la St-Thomas, par A. Bleton, Lyon, 1891*.

⁴In 1512, he was taxed 14 *livres*, 9 *sols* and 7 *livres*, 4 *sols* ; in 1513, 13 *livres* ; in 1514, 17 *livres*, 2 *sols*. CC 116 ; 117 ; 122.

⁵CC 627 ; 628 ; 632 ; 641 ; 644.

years later he and the widow of Pierre Scève, his brother, owned landed estates in the parish of Ecully.¹ Maurice Scève père, probably died about 1522. During the years 1528-29, a Florentine, Julien Nerini, occupied the house of the deceased, which was situated in the rue de l'Aumône between the mansions of Guillaume Mellier, *lieutenant particulier* of Lyons, a wealthy and prominent lawyer, and André Dumas, also doctor of laws.²

Maurice Scève père, left four children, one son and three daughters. Of the daughters, Jeanne was married on the fourth of May, 1530, to Jean Choul, doct. of laws, son and heir of Guichard Choul, doct. of laws, a wealthy citizen of Lyons.³ Sibille became the wife of Jérôme Tolomé and left two daughters. And finally Claudine, to whom Charles de Ste-Marthe addressed an epistle in 1540, was married to Mathieu de Vauzelles, one of the celebrated trio of brothers, and left two sons, Mathieu and Léonard.⁴

Of the son, Maurice, the poet, it is interesting to note that, in 1539, he and Guillaume Mellier, the distinguished lawyer, are ordered *de faire un gect et form des ystoires qu'il conviendra faire* for the entrance into Lyons of Hippolyte d'Este, Cardinal of Ferrara, who had just been appointed Archbishop of Lyons. This ceremony took place the twenty-sixth of February, 1539.⁵

In 1547, Jean de Tournes published an edition of Dante, which was prefaced by an epistle addressed *al molto ingenioso*

¹ CC 22 ; 53.

² CC 24 ; 37 ; and cf. Perneti, I, pp. 317-20.

³ *Cab. de Titres, Carrés de d'Hozier*, 583.

⁴ Cf. Ste-Marthe's *Poésie*, Lyon, 1540, p. 157 ; L. de Vauzelles, *Notices sur Mathieu de Vauzelles*, 1870, p. 8 ; *Cab. de d'Hoz.*, 311. In 1563, Henry Scève, *contrerolleur ancien pour le Roy*, has charge of the property of *ses chers cousins Mathieu et Léonard de Vauzelles, enfants héritiers de feu Mathieu de Vauzelles*. CC 1118, etc.

⁵ BB 58.

et docto M. Mauritio Sceva. In this epistle, dated the twenty-fourth of March, 1547, the printer acknowledges his indebtedness to the poet and begs him to act as sponsor for the work.¹

In the same year Philibert de Vienne addressed a sonnet to Scève in his *Philosophe de Court*; while in the *Temple de Chasteté* of François Habert, which appeared in the latter part of 1547, there is a poem by *Maurice Sene* (sic), *poete françoys, demourant à Lyon* (fo. F).

In 1551, Jean de Vauzelles, one of the three well-known brothers mentioned above, sent a letter to his friend, Pietro Aretino, in which he speaks highly of the emblems in the *Délie*² of Maurice Scève—*i quali*, says he, *a giuditio mio, non posporesti in gran elegantie, inventioni e bei discorsi a molti vostri moderni et antichi. Ma, perchè le rime nostre sono assai difficile a chi non le ha usate, non mi sono altramente disposto a mandarvene, bench'io non dubito che le giudicaresti degne d'esser italiane per più gratia.*³

In 1556, François Habert addressed a *huitain* to Scève in his *Excellence de Poésie* (p. 22); and the *Erotasmes* of Philibert Bugnyon, published in 1557, contain a quatrain dedicated to the Lyonnese poet (p. 75). In addition to the above, we may mention the acrostic by Scève in the *Divers Rapportz* (p. 273) of E. de Beaulieu.

To return to the uncles of the poet, we may first consider Pierre Scève, the draper, who occupied, in 1493, a large house in the *rue de Bourgneuf*. He possessed besides *des maisons, vignes, terres et prés* in the parishes of St-Didier, St-

¹ *Il Dante, // Con argomenti, & dechiaratione de molti luoghi, nuonamente reuisto, & stampato. / In Lione, / Per Giouan di Tournes. / 1547. In-16 of 539 pp. Bibl. nat. Yd., 2117. Cf. pp. 3-4. Cf. also Picot, Les Français italianisants au XVI^e siècle, Paris, 1906, I, pp. 171-2.*

² Lyon, Sulpice Sabon, 1544, in 8°.

³ *Lettere scritte a P. Aretino*, Bologna, 1874, II, II, p. 328; cf. also Picot, *Ibid.*, I, pp. 156-7.

Cyr-au-Mont-d'Or and Ecully. His total tax for the year amounted to the handsome sum of 182 *livres* 15 *sols*. Pierre died sometime before 1518.¹ His son, Pierre Scève, was elected *échevin* of Lyons in 1544, and again in 1546, 1549, 1551, 1554, 1557, 1559, 1561 and 1562.² In 1548, he was elected *commis à la recepte*, or treasurer, of the *Aulmosne générale*, a position that he filled for a number of years. In 1552, he and his wife, Clémence, were reimbursed for a large sum of money loaned to the city in 1542. At Christmas, 1556, Pierre Scève and several other *échevins* gave their entire salaries for the two preceding years to the Hospital of the Pont du Rhône.³ The following year Charles Fontaine addressed some laudatory verses to Pierre Scève in the *Ode de l'Antiquité et Excellence de la Ville de Lyon*.⁴

Another uncle of the poet, Maurice, was Jean Scève, a merchant of Lyons, who became *seigneur de Montelier*. In 1510, he was elected *échevin* of Lyons. The tax-receipts for 1513 show that he and his son-in-law, Jean Coyaud, owned considerable property at Chasselay.⁵ The following year, 1514, the *échevins* of Lyons returned to him more than 13,757 *livres*, which he had loaned to the city at various times. Jean Scève died before 1518, leaving property at Chasselay, St-Didier, and elsewhere.⁶ It appears that he left a son, Jean Scève, who became *prieur de Montrottier* in 1559, succeeding Jean de Vauzelles. During the same

¹ It is possible that Guillaume Scève, the wealthy Latin poet, was a son of Pierre. Cf. also CC 12 ; 53.

² BB 370 ; CC 972, 996, 1085, etc.

³ CC 986 ; 1010 ; 1035.

⁴ Baudrier, *Bibliographie lyonnaise*, II, p. 27. In 1597, there was a *président et lieutenant-général en la sénéchaussée de Lyon* by the name of Pierre de Scève. B 328.

⁵ BB 370 ; CC 119. Jean Coyaud loaned 20 *livres* for the ransom of François I^{er} in 1529, but died before 1535, when the sum was returned to his widow, Antonie Scève. CC 871.

⁶ CC 117 ; 55 ; 56, etc.

year Jean Scève published *La Ruine et Trébuchement de Mars, Dieu des Guerriers*, which contained a short eulogy of the Cardinal of Lorraine.¹ He died early in 1560; and on the fourteenth of July of that year, his property was divided between the brothers, Pierre Scève, seigneur de Montelier, Jean Scève, seigneur de St-André, and Antoine Scève.²

Of the two remaining uncles of the poet, we know first that Michel was appointed royal tax-collector in July, 1512, at a salary of 300 *livres*. He died the following year, leaving his widow, Louise de Ville, and his children creditors of the city of Lyons to the extent of 467 *livres* which he had contributed for its defense.³ And finally, Barthélemy was appointed tax-collector in June, 1524. In 1527, he and several others were reimbursed for the sum of 9000 *livres*, loaned to the city in May, 1522.⁴

Pernette Scève, one of the aunts of the poet, was already widow of the *capitaine des vaches*, Brognon, in 1493. During that year, she sold two houses and a garden in Lyons to Jean de St-Romain, sgr. de Vaurys. In addition to other property, she owned a large house between the gates of Pierre-Scize and Bourgneuf, *du costé de la montaigne de Fourvières*, which the former treasurer and receiver of the city, Alardin Varinier, had bequeathed to her. She was still living in 1514.⁵

JOHN L. GERIG.

¹ Lyon, Jean Saugrain, 1559, in 4to, *Bibl. de Versailles*, E 416c; Goujet, *Biblioth. française*, XI, p. 451; Picot, *Ibid.*, I, p. 159.

² *Carrés de d'Hoz.*, 583. The Jean de Scève, sgr. de Froment et de Fléchères, conseiller du Roi, receveur-général de ses finances, échevin de Lyon, to whom Claude de Rubys addressed in 1603 the *avant-propos* of his *Histoire véritable de la ville de Lyon* (fo. 6) is possibly the seigneur de St-André mentioned above. Baudrier, *Bibl. lyon.*, I, 311.

³ CC 116; 117; 253; 321, etc.

⁴ CC 116; 117; 253; 321, etc.; 261; 263; 748.

⁵ CC 12; 321; 322, etc.

XVIII.—ON THE HISTORY OF PALATAL *ɲ* IN FRENCH WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO *o* AND OPEN *e*.

The normal sign for *ɲ* in Old French is *ign*. The consonantal portion of this trigraph represents the value of Latin *gn* as felt or pronounced in the Merovingian period in such words as *magnus*, *agnellus*, the sequence of development probably being *gn* > *ɲn* > *ɲ̃n* > *ɲ* thru the fronting influence of *n* upon the preceding *ɲ*. That the vowel *i* should have been added to *gn* with this new palatal value will not appear strange to anyone familiar with the history of palatalized consonants in Old French. It represents the vowel glide which is potentially present whenever a palatalized consonant follows after a vowel. Its appearance in writing must therefore be due to a definite consciousness of its presence as a phonic element in the spoken syllable. In other words, the scribes who invented the trigraph *ign* must have heard and felt the vowel. And as a matter of fact, the modern pronunciation of this sound in final position and before consonant shows that this assumption is accurate; for *gain*, *coin*, *juin* presuppose an earlier pronunciation *gāiɲ*, *kōiɲ*, *džyiɲ*, and *plaindre* and *joindre* must have passed thru *plāindre*, *džōindre*. However, if this evidence may be accepted as conclusive for the presence of the *i* under these conditions, there is equally strong evidence in the modern language that in medial position (*montagne*, *gagner*, *besogne*) the palatal glide did not develop into a full vowel. It is assumed therefore that, tho present in the beginning under all conditions, it was maintained only when the group was final or followed by a consonant, while in intervocalic position it was early reabsorbed by the following palatal;

and this is the opinion maintained by Behrens; Schwan-Behrens, *Gram.*, § 203. Nyrop, *Gram.*, §§ 228–231, goes even farther. He apparently denies the presence of the glide in medial position in the language at any time; so that for him the conditions of the development are clearly evidenced by the modern pronunciation, *champagne*, *agneau* but *coin*, *ceindre*.

Yet this explanation plainly begs the question at issue; for no one can deny the presence of the vowel involved, in writing at least, in Old French in all positions. If it be accepted, we are bound to conclude that the vowel, where *ign* stood between vowels in Old French, was purely graphic, a stand which is boldly taken by Brunot, when he says in his *Histoire de la langue française*, I, p. 487: "Il faut donc se garder de prendre dans l'a. fr. *esloigner*, *empoigner*, *montaigne*, les groupes *oi*, *ai*, pour des diphthongues (cela est vrai seulement pour quelques textes dialectaux): en francien on prononçait *estōñer*, *āpōñer*, *mōtāñe*." If it should be objected that the modern pronunciation of *soigner*, *moignon*, *châtaigne*, *araignée* militates against this view, the answer would probably be made that we have in these and similar words a modern readjustment. Since *ign* has here been retained, the language has attempted to reproduce in pronunciation the now official orthography.

But this view of the problem is not supported by the facts. In *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXI, pp. 668 ff., I have shown that *a* and *e* + *ñ*, written ordinarily *aign* and *eign*, had an identical pronunciation during the whole Old French period, for the two are constantly found riming together. However, their common value varied with the dialects. On the one hand in Norman and Francian both were pronounced *ēñe*, and on the other in a large region, including Picardy and Champagne, their common value must have been *āñe*. It follows that in

the one district the *i*, which is constant everywhere, must have been purely graphic, while in the other it must have had its customary phonic value; for the pronunciation of *êñ* for *aign* presupposes the series *âiñ* > *êiñ* > *êñ* parallel to that of *a* + *n* > *âin* > *êin* > *ê*. Furthermore, no difference is evident in the value of this syllable resulting from its position in the word; so that the rule given in our Old French grammars, *a* + *ñ* medial = *âñ*, final = *âiñ* (*champagne*, *copain*) has no actual value and in reality obscures the history of the syllables under consideration.

The problem involved is equally present in the history of *o* + *ñ*. The modern orthography here shows in final position *in* (*coin*, *loin*, *témoin*), more rarely *ing* (*coing*, *poing*, *vieux-oiing*), pronounced *uê* with the occasional variant *uâ*. In medial position *ogn* is most common, pronounced *ɣñ* (*vergogne*, *besogne*, *rogner*). However, in some words the older spelling *oign* has been preserved, and then the pronunciation varies between *ɣñ* and *uañ* as *poigne* (= *pɣñ* and *puañ*), *poignard*, *poignant*, *poignée*, and *moignon*. In *oignon* the same trigraph has only the value of *ɣñ*, while it is pronounced *uañ* in *joignons*, *témoigner*, *soigner*.

The object of the present study is to determine whether the conclusions made evident for the history of *a* + *ñ* apply equally to that of the other vowels. The investigation is based upon the comprehensive list of texts cited in my previous article, pp. 638–642. Words with *e* + *ñ* cannot enter into the discussion, for here the *i* is always written, as in *teigne*, *enseigner*. However, the pronunciation would not be altered even tho this vowel sign were omitted; *ensegne* would still be pronounced *âseñ*, so that it is possible to look upon the letter here as purely graphic. But it is different with *o* + *ñ*, as already indicated, and with *e* + *ñ*; cf. *engigne*, *peigne*, and *viegne*.

I.

It must be granted that the facts surrounding the history of *o* + *ñ* may be similar in nature to those made evident for that of *a* + *ñ*. Since in Francian *aign* meant *ēñ*, we should expect *oign* to have been *ōñ*; and since this *i* has left no trace in the modern pronunciation of either syllable, its disappearance presents a problem that calls for an explanation. Furthermore, if modern *châtaigne* and *araignée* are remnants of the regular development of this syllable in the Francian dialect, the possibility must be recognized that *moignon*, *soigner*, and the like may have a similar history.

The key to the problem should be found in the rimes of the same long list of texts utilized for the elucidation of the history of *aign* and *eign*, but unfortunately the conditions are much less favorable in the present study. The rimes here are obscure and indifferent. Words in *oigne* rime only with others having the same ending, so that no conclusions as to the pronunciation are possible from this source. We are thrown back upon the orthography.

The earliest instance of *ñ* in writing occurs in *degnet* (*Eul.*, 26). This text being Picard, the absence of the *i* is quite in harmony with what we can observe subsequently in other manuscripts of the same region. In later texts we find *ign* with numerous variants. In this trigraph, as emphasized above, the *i* can be explained only if understood as the graphic representation of a vowel glide that was clearly heard and felt. However, a vowel of such origin is dependent upon its surroundings. While it may rise to the value of an independent speech element, it may equally well remain dependent upon the conditions that produced it, and may eventually be reabsorbed. The former possibility lies at the root of the history of *aign* in Norman and Fran-

cian ; the latter explains its value as *āñ* in Picard. When this trigraph has been accepted as the symbol for medial *ñ*, we find it employed in the atonic as well as in the tonic syllable. Suchier, *Altfrz. Gram.*, p. 72, claims that the glide developed in the atonic syllable and was carried from there to the tonic syllable. However, he advances no argument to support this view, and it would seem that the opposite process is, theoretically at least, the more likely. In a somewhat similar way *bels* becomes *beals*, while *BELLITATEM* remains *belté* until it is changed to *bealté* under the influence of *beals*. At any rate, this point of view is apparently borne out by the orthography of the *Montébourg Psalter*. This text presents 74 instances of *seignur(s)* as compared with an overwhelming list of examples of *segnur(s)* and *ségnor(s)*—267 occurrences, if my count is exact. In the other vocables of this text containing *ñ* the relation of the two spellings (*ign* and *gn*) is more obscured, since the orthography hesitates between them, yet on the whole *gn* appears more frequently in the atonic than in the tonic syllable. But this distinction, apparently felt in the *Montébourg Psalter*, is completely obliterated in the other prose texts of this period, such as the *Cambridge Psalter* and the *Quatre Livres des Rois*. In consequence, *ign* becomes the normal expression for *ñ* and appears as such in all the standard texts of the twelfth century, such as *Enéas*, the *Roman de Troie*, the *Chronique des Ducs de Normandie*, the *Roman de Rou*, *Marie de France*, and others.

By its side, however, we find variants creeping in, and of this somewhat lengthy list *ingn*, *gn*, and *ngn* are the most important for our purpose. In a question of orthography such as the present, the spelling of our texts as we read them now can of course not furnish any final arguments. A modern editor can reproduce only the orthography of one manuscript, and this is scarcely ever contemporary with the

author and is, moreover, frequently colored by the orthographic habits and traditions of a different region. In the present problem we have the additional complication that the various methods of writing *ñ* appear in complete confusion in the texts of the thirteenth century and later. And yet their original purpose and intention are fairly clear.

Since the vowel before *ñ* was nasalized in Old French, *ign* might readily have seemed an inadequate spelling. In consequence, *ingn* (*aingn*, *oingn*) was devised to obviate the obscurity. On the other hand, in a dialect where the palatal glide before *ñ* was so weak that it was not heard or could be neglected, *gn* (*agn*, *ogn*) would be established, and then *ngn* (*angn*, *ongn*) might be utilized to mark the nasalization of the preceding vowels. Thus the ordinary types of spelling for *ñ* give clear evidence of two main variants of pronunciation, and they authorize the inference that during the Old French period *āiñ* and *ōiñ* were heard as well as *āñ* and *ōñ*. The question is, to determine whether this division was in any way dialectic. The matter would be simple if our manuscripts were consistent. But this is not the case; quite on the contrary, the impression is created that the meanings which the various symbols must have had at first were completely lost, and that only whim and not consciousness of utterance decided their choice. This conclusion is without doubt largely correct, and yet closer scrutiny reveals a dialectic tendency in their usage. Norman and Francian manuscripts show *ign* and *ingn* almost exclusively, while certain Picard manuscripts, such as the *Trouvères Belges* published by Scheler, present a large preponderance of forms with *gn* and *ngn*. To be sure, this distinction is not observed with sufficient regularity to establish a dialectic difference of pronunciation beyond question. But, added to other evidence brought forward in my previous study, it forms a valuable argument in the discus-

sion, leading to the conclusion that *aign* and *eign* were pronounced $\tilde{e}h$ or $\tilde{a}h$, depending upon the dialect.

If this is correct, the general analogy of linguistic development and the fact that identical linguistic conditions produce identical results must lead us to infer that a similar variation existed for $o + h$. Where *aign* was $\tilde{a}h$, *oign* should mean $\tilde{o}h$, and where the former was $\tilde{e}h$ the other should have the value of $\tilde{o}i\tilde{h}$. As far as I know, the rimes contain no absolute evidence for the pronunciation $\tilde{o}h$. The Picard author of *Octavian* paired *non* : *besoing*, l. 1527, but this rime might mean $\tilde{o}n$: $\tilde{o}i\tilde{h}$. Certain rime habits of the Parisian Rutebuef show, however, that for the Francian dialect our inference is correct. If *oign* there had the value of $\tilde{o}i\tilde{h}$, we should expect the diphthong *oi* of this syllable to participate in the general shift of $\acute{o}i > \acute{o}e > \acute{o}\acute{e}$; $\acute{o}i\tilde{h}$ should have become $\acute{o}e\tilde{h}$. The rimes just referred to in Rutebuef show that this took place in the words of our group. This author rimes *oigne* with *aigne*, *eigne*, *iegne*, and *PRENDEAM. The following is a list of these rimes already cited in my previous article, p. 672, the references being to the pages where they are found in the edition of Jubinal, Paris, 1874-1875 :—

Mainteingne : *enseingne* : *veingne* : *tiengne* : *compeingne* : *esloigne*, I-22 ; *soustiengne* : *besoingne*, I-82 ; *avaloinngnes* : *lontainngnes* : *essoingnes*, I-241 ; *enseigne* : *besoingne*, II-85 : *ouvrainngne* : *vergoingne*, II-176 ; *coviegne* : *besoingne*, II-184 ; *souviogne* : *besoingne*, II-294 ; *praingne* : *besoingne*, II-311 ; *viengne* : *besoingne*, II-354 ; *doingne* : *viengne*, II-376. Similar examples in other texts are exceedingly rare. I am able to add only *saine* : *essoine*, *Rom. Rose*, I-73, *remaigne* : *daigne* (= *doigne*) *ibid.*, I-257, and the laisse on p. 316 of Guessard and Chabaille's edition of the *Roman de Gaufrey*, where *essoigne*, *Couloigne*, *Sessoigne*, *vergoigne*, *besongne* rime with words in *aigne* and *eigne*, with *entente* and with *jenne* (= *jeune*). The

conclusion must be that we have to do with a rime licence. But in the nature of things this licence would not have been thought of if the pronunciation of the syllable had not suggested it. And since the only value of *oigne* which could suggest pairing with *aigne* (= *ēne*) is *oēne*, it follows that this was the pronunciation upon which Rutebuef founded his practice.

But Rutebuef belongs to the period when *oi*, pronounced *oe*, had just shifted or was just shifting its accent to *oé*. Guiot de Provins rimes *oi* + *n* with *o* + *n*; cf. *Antoine* : *none* (*Bible*, 574). *Guillaume de Dole*, which furnishes the earliest rime of *aint* : *oint* (*maint* : *esloint*, 4192) shows similar hesitancy with regard to the accent in *compegnon* : *besoig*, 3376; and Rutebuef himself joins *quenoille* : *besoingne*, II-373.¹ This unstable position of the accent probably contains the explanation of why the example set by Rutebuef was not followed by later authors. During the period of shift, *ōene* and *oēne* must for a time have existed side by side. Rutebuef, daring with his rimes, used the advanced stage, but after a period of hesitation the language ended by deciding in favor of the older, and proceeded forthwith to modify it in such a way that the rimes of Rutebuef became impossible. In fact, it is easy to see why *ōene* should have become *ōne*. The original glide *i* is here supplanted by a vowel which thru its comparatively low tongue position is in reality antagonistic to its surroundings. It might be argued that the language would not have changed *ōine* to *ōene* if this were the case. But it must not be forgotten that the change of *oi* > *oe* at this period was sweeping, and that from our general observation of phonetic processes we have every reason to believe that *oi* before *ñ*

¹ *Couloingne* : *donne* (subjunctive), *ibid.*, II-36, is not safe, since *donne* may stand for *doigne*.

underwent the same influence. A language does not consciously protect a syllable against a fundamental process of phonetic development because the result might be distasteful or uncongenial, but it accepts the change and then modifies the result according to its pleasure. Moreover, there are two related categories of words in which the shift under consideration did unquestionably occur:—

1. Words ending in *oine* (*moine*, *avoine*) changed regularly *oe* > *oé* > modern *ua*. These words are occasionally found in rime with those of our group, the pairing of *h*:*n* being not impossible in Old French; cf. *essoigne*:*moine*, *Rom. du Mont S. Michel*, 101; *moine*:*testemoine*, *ibid.*, 1375, 2384; *persoine*:*moigne*:*chanoine*:*essoine*, *Livre des Manières*, ccciv; *essoine*:*patrimoine*, *Rutebuef*, I-112; *poingne*:*sovrainne*:*moinne*:*essoinne*, *ibid.*, I-153; *raine* (REGNUM):*chanoine*, II-119; *ouvraingne*:*raine* (REGNUM), II-283; *raine* (REGNAT):*vilaine*, II-206.

2. Where the syllable *oiñ* was final in the word, as in *besoing*, *coing*, it passed thru *oēñ* > *oēñ* > *oé*.

Both categories must have had a certain influence in keeping medial *oign* in line with the general development of the language, at least until the stage *oēñe* had been reached. At this point, however, two possibilities are apparent. On the one hand, the second element in the diphthong could be made more sonant and then of necessity attract the accent (*oēñe*), a pronunciation which authorized Rutebuef's rimes. On the other, its natural weak sonancy might favor its suppression; and it was this second alternative which gained the day. Soon after Rutebuef's time, perhaps even contemporaneously with him, medial *oign* became *oñ*, and from this point of view Eustache Deschamps's rime, II-330, *Gascongne*:*besongne*:*escaloinngne*:*doingne*:*ressoingne*:*Baionne*:*donne*:*essoingne*, where our syllable evidently has this value, is perfectly accurate.

When this pronunciation had become established, *ogn* and *ongn*, already familiar to the scribes, gained the ascendancy in writing, and hence their predominance in the Francian texts of the later Middle Ages. The printed text of the *Escoufle* shows in the rimes the following proportion: *aign* 41, *aingn* 3, *eign* 3, *egn* 1, *engn* 1, *oign* 9, *oingn* 1, *ongn* 2; *Guillaume de Dole*: *aign* 16, *egn* 5, *oign* 32; *Roman de la Rose*: *aign* 47, *aingn* 43, *eign* 27, *eingn* 3, *egn* 7, *engn* 6, *oign* 36, *oingn* 22, *ongn* 2. The difference between these and the manuscript of the *Miracles de Nostre Dame* is striking; in the first two volumes of this text I have noted: *aign* 4, *aingn* 2, *agn* 3, *eign* 27, *eingn* 1, *engn* 4, *oign* 2, *oingn* 19, *ongn* 31. In Villon's rimes we find: *aign* 9, *eign* 3, *ongn* 7; in Marot: *aign* 40, *agn* 2, *eign* 11, *ongn* 21, *oingn* 5. These figures are not in any way absolute, for they were not compiled with the idea of being complete, but they show nevertheless the gradual growth of the orthographic habits in the Francian dialect, and they emphasize the conclusion of the present investigation, that modern *on* and *an* owe their existence to different causes and chronologically belong to different periods in the history of the language. While the latter became established during the sixteenth century, owing to circumstances suggested in my previous article, pp. 684–685, the former is the result of the phonetic development of the Francian dialect during the thirteenth century. In both cases the *i* written before *gn* represented originally a fully pronounced vowel in the syllable. When preceded by *a* it raised the tongue position of this vowel so as to change it to *e* and produce with it the diphthong *ei*. The resultant *ēiñ* coincided with *e* + *ñ* and rimed with that syllable as late as Marot. In the case of *o* + *ñ* the same glide *i* had no influence on the preceding vowel, and when the stage *ōiñ* > *ōeñ* had been reached during the thirteenth century, the now disfigured glide disappeared because it failed to harmonize with its surroundings.

If this interpretation of the development is correct, and apparently no other is permissible, the modern forms of the words of our group all find a satisfactory explanation.

1. Wherever *o* + *h* is pronounced *oh*, which is true of the majority of words when the group in question is medial, we observe the regular development in the Francian dialect. Examples are *hogne*, *cigogne*, *vergogne*, *rogne*, *charogne*, *trogne*, *ivrogne* and geographical names like *Gascogne*, *Dordogne*, *Bourgogne*, *Bologne*, *Boulogne*, *Cologne*, *Pologne*.

2. In another list of words the group occurs in final or in medial position with regular development in either case. Cf. *coing*—*cognasse*, *cognassier*, *coin*—*cogner*, *groin*—*grogner*, *besoin*—*besogne*, *besogner*, *besogneux*.

3. In a third group the form of the syllable which developed in final position or before a consonant, has influenced its pronunciation in medial position and caused the introduction of the diphthong. Cf. *loin*—*éloigner*, *témoin*—*témoigner*, *soin*—*soigner*, *joindre*—*joignons*, *oindre*—*oignons*.

4. In the derivatives of *poing* (*poigne*, *poignée*, *poignard*, *empoigner*) both *oh* and *uañ* are current, and one is tempted to look upon the form with the diphthong as reaching back into the period when Rutebuef paired the rimes which we have discussed above. On this assumption, however, the spelling *poigne* cannot be separated from the pronunciation *puañe*, and *pɔñe* remains unexplained. If, on the other hand, *pɔñe* is the regular form, written *poigne* thru association with *poing*, or because the medieval spelling has been preserved (as in *moignon* and *oignon*), the modern diphthong finds a satisfactory explanation when looked upon as due to influence of the written form of the word. This is certainly true of *moignon*, pronounced both *moñō* and *muañō*; while in the case of *oignon* the old orthography has been preserved without influence on the pronunciation.

5. *Bourguignon*, finally, is entirely irregular and isolated. Suchier, *Altfrz. Gram.*, p. 72, cites the word together with *joignons* as proof for his theory that the glide vowel became prominent first in pretonic position. In this instance it even ended by becoming the sole vowel of the syllable. I doubt whether this point of view is correct. The regular Old French form of this word is *Borgoignon* or *Burguignon*, whose value is made clear by *Bourgongnon*, found in Charles d'Orléans, I-163. The vowel of the modern form of the word is similar to that found in *connissons* (*connoissons*), *chantissions* (*chantassions*), *travillier* (*travaillier*), *orgillous* (*orgueilleux*), *genillons* (*genoillons*), *desverilliés* (*déverrouillez*), *Avignon*; the weakened counter-final vowel becomes *i* under the influence of the following consonant. The age of this modern form, which may be, moreover, dialectic,¹ is difficult to determine; the form seems to exist in Charles d'Orléans, II-55.

This readjustment of the pronunciation apparently does not belong to the Old French period. As late as the sixteenth century the general pronunciation of our group seems to have been *oh*, a fact which is clearly evident from the statements of the grammarians cited by Thurot, *De la Prononciation française*, II, p. 525. The older spellings *oign* and *oingn* continued to be employed—we have seen that in a few words the old orthography persists to the present day—and the older grammarians insist that this way of writing is not in accord with the pronunciation. Ramus (1562) recommends the spelling *témonher*, *sonher*, *conher* for this reason, and a similar intention is evident in the rules of Bèze (1584) and Tabourot (1587).

At the same time a grouping of our words resembling

¹ Cf. *Châtelain de Couci*, 886. The ms. printed by Crapelet has *Bourgoingnons*, but the other ms. (Bibl. Nat. F. Fr. 7514) writes *Bourghegnons*.

somewhat the modern readjustment is given by Lanoue (1596). He writes *hongne*, *congner*, *songner*, *bezongne*, *bezongner*, *cigongne*, *vergongne*, *vergongner*, *empongnier*, *eslongner*, *rongner*, *rongne*, *charongne*, *tesmongner*, *grongner*, *trongne*, *renfrongner*, *yrongne*, but he accepts *oi* in *oigne*, *joigne* and its compounds, *poigne*, *espoigne* and he adds *hoigne*, *coigne*, *soigne*, *empoigne*, *esloigne*, *tesmoigne*, *groigne*, "qui peuvent recevoir ceste orthographe et la prononciation aussi." He writes *poignard*, *poignet* without further remark, but he notes, of *oignon* and *roignon*, "selon qu'on les prononce, il les vaudroit mieux orthographier ainsi, *ongnon* et *rongnon*."

A similar hesitation between the old and the new pronunciation is evident from the phonetic transcriptions of Meigret and Baïf. They are contemporaries, and yet Meigret¹ (1550) writes *joñant*, *poñard*, *Bourgoñe*, *joñet* (= *joignent*), *conjoñant*, *conjoñet* (*conjoignent*), *eloñee* (*éloignée*), *bezoñes*, *yrroñes*, *oñons* (from *oindre*), *Boloñe*, while Baïf² (1569) notes different values, tho his pronunciation does not always agree with the modern habit. Cf. *soeñe*, *soeñus*, *soeñuzemant*, *eloeñes*, *eloeñe*, *eloeñer*, *eloeñeront*, *eloeñés*, *vergoeñe*, *vergoeñeus*, *anpoeñe*, *témoeneñaje*, *joeneñant*, *bezoñé*.

II.

The conclusion that the meaning of *ign* in Old French depends upon the dialect finds to a certain degree confirmation in the history of $\epsilon + \acute{n}$. The number of words in this category is not very large. We have to consider only *INGENIUM*, *INGENIARE*, *PECTEN* and the present subjunctives of *VENIRE* and *TENERE*.

¹*Trehtë de la Grammere Françoïse*, published by Förster, Heilbronn, 1888.

²*Psaultier*, published by Groth, Heilbronn, 1888.

INGENIUM appears in two forms, *engin* and *engien*, which are clearly distinguished dialectically.

1. *Engin*. This form represents the normal Norman spelling of the word; cf. *Quatre Livres des Rois*, 198-11, 199-10, 246-5, 250-13, 252-3, 372-12, 434-12; *Enéas*, 131, 504; and other Norman texts. It is confirmed by the rimes; cf. *engin* : *mulin*, Marie de France, *Fables*, III-3, 43; —: *veisin*, XII-31; —: *parchemin*, *Milun*, 254; —: *Kaherdin*, Thomas, *Tristan*, 1295, 2129, 2663, 3013; —: *matins*, 1707; —: *escrin*, *Folie Tristan d'Oxford*,¹ 437; —: *venim*, 427; —: *gardin*, *Escoufle*, 3355; —: *fin*, Maître Elie's *Art d'Amour*, 809; —: *lin*, *Partonopeus*, 8269. One or two additional instances are noted by Godefroy, s. v. It is the regular Francian form used from Rutebuef to Marot.

2. *Engien*. In this spelling the word rimes usually with *bien*; cf. *Chev. II Esp.*, 2905; *Galeran*, 1140; *Méliador*, 111, 639; Bodel, *Jeu de S. Nicolas*, 186; Adam de la Halle, *Jeu de la Feuillée*, 56; *Rom. Renart*, VI-97; Mousket, *Chronique*, 19568; *engien* : *tien*, *Jeu de S. Nicolas*, 206.

This distinction is striking inasmuch as the first group represents the territory where *aigne* sounded *ēne*, while the other contains texts in which the same syllable had the value of *āne*. *Engin* is thus clearly seen to be a reduction of *engiein*, while *engien* belongs to the region where the parasitic *i* before *ñ* was absent.

INGENIARE. The same distinction in the stem-accented forms of this verb should give us *engigne* or *engiegne*. The existence of the former is fully established by rimes in the Norman and Francian texts; cf. *vingne* : *engingne* : *grinne* : *esgaugine*, *Livre des Manières*, CLXXV; *engigne* : *vigne*, Guil-

¹ *Les deux poèmes de la Folie Tristan* publiés par Bédier, Paris, 1907 (Soc. d. Anc. Textes).

laume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, 1157,—: *rechigne*, 1331; *engignent*: *barguignent*, Rutebuef, I-113, *engingne*: *barguingne*, II-115; *engigne*: *ligne*, Guiot de Provins, *Bible*, 1390, *engignent*: *lignent*, 2518; *bigne*: *foligne*: *engigne*: *vigne*, Christine de Pisan, *Débat de Deux Amans*, 1388. The same rime exists also in the *Rom. Renart*; cf. *engigne*: *hocepigne*, I-1873, *vigne*: *enginne*, x-451, *engingne*: *rechigne*, III-45.

Forms with *ie* are also found, which is proof that this variant of the pronunciation existed; but they are exceedingly rare, and are moreover not free from doubt. In the texts examined I have found only *engiegne*: *tiegne*, *Rom. Renart*, I-2403, 2429; and *engigne*: *Conpigne* (= *Compiegne*), *ibid.*, VII-75. Since *tiegne* might stand for *tigne* (cf. *vingne* (VINEA): *avingne*, Beaudouin de Condé, *Prisons d'Amours*, 1856), it is not impossible that the orthography of the former pair of rimes does not represent the pronunciation, and for the same reason *Conpigne* might be a legitimate variant of the geographical proper name. I may cite also two sequences of rimes in the poems of the Renclus de Moiliens; cf. *engigne*: *progigne* (*PROGENIA): *desconvigne*: *sovigne*: *avigne*: *parvigne*, *Curité*, 211; and *coviegne*: *viegne*: *soviegne*: *sorviegne*: *aviegne*: *parviegne*, *Miserere*, 197. Here the possibility must be recognized that the orthography of one or the other strophe is inaccurate. Van Hamel, *ed.*, p. cxviii, decided in favor of *i*, and he was probably correct, for *ain* in this author's speech had become *ein*,¹ and analogy leads us to infer that *aiñ* likewise had changed to *eiñ*. In that case *ie* + *ñ* passed thru *ieiñ*, which was reduced to *iñ*.

PECTEN. After proposing, in *Zs. f. rom. Phil.*, VIII, p. 237, an erroneous explanation, which he later abandoned, Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Gram.*, I, § 157, cites *pigne* from the

¹ Cp. *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXI, p. 666.

Rom. de Brut, 3905, and explains *peigne* as due to influence of the ending-accented forms of the verb. This statement is without doubt correct; however, *pigne* is much more frequent than the single citation from the *Brut* would seem to suggest; cp. *pigne* : *signe*, *Chev. II Esp.*, 4805; *pigne* (verb) : *guigne*, *Rom. Rose*, 1-72; *ligne* : *vigne* : *empigne* : *pigne*, *L'Amant rendu Cordelier*, 1466. The same form may be found outside of the rime: *Durmart*, 3089; Charles d'Orléans, 11-104; Marot, 1-16; cf. also *pingnes*, *Crieries de Paris*, 144. It must be a reduction of *pieïne* similar to *engin* and *engigne*, yet its presence in the *Chev. II Esp.* is strange, for there the trigraph *ign* in all probability denoted *ñ*.

Peigne, *Floris et Liriope*, 866, may be found in rime with *Espaigne*, Guillaume Alexis, *Le a b c des Doubles*, 485. Other instances are cited by Godefroy, s. v. In Chrétien's *Lancelot*, 1363, Foerster writes *paingne* with the value of *pāñe*. One of the manuscripts at this place writes *piegne*, a variant which can also be found elsewhere; cf. *pieigne*, Beroul, *Tristan*, 4421.

VENIAM, TENEAM. The present subjunctives of *venir* and *tenir* are written in Old French *viegne*, *tiegne*, *veigne*, *teigne*, and *vaigne*, *taigne*. Forms like *viegne* and *tiegne* are so rare that they may be disregarded. My examples include in general only the rimes of the texts upon which this study is based, but in this long list I noted only *viegne* : *tieigne*, *Chev. II Esp.*, 9449; *souvieingne*, Eustache Deschamps, 1-102. Other instances no doubt exist, but they are sporadic. This fact has its bearing on the general question under discussion, for it shows a conscious handling on the part of the copyists of the vowel in the trigraph *ign*. If it could be constantly omitted in *tiegne* and *viegne* it must have had a definite value in other words where we find it equally con-

stantly written, at least at the time when the Old French orthographic traditions were formed.

In the older texts the regular form is *viegne*, *tiegne*. We should expect *vigne* and *tigne* in the Norman and Francian dialects, but these forms were crowded out thru the influence of the indicative forms. However, they are not at all infrequent in the manuscripts of the *Trouvères Belges* and can also be supported by rimes; cf. *vigne*:*avingne* in the *Prisons d'Amours* already cited, and the rimes in the poems of the Renclus de Moiliens discussed above. Yet, they are not free from difficulty. While they are apparently regular in *Carité* and *Miserere*, Beaudouin de Condé belongs to the region where the parasitic *i* did not develop before *ñ*, and as a matter of fact he pairs *ouvragne*:*vaigne* in the same poem, l. 503.

If we now examine the use of these words in the Norman and Francian rimes, we shall find that as late as Benoît de Sainte-More the two words are only paired together. However, beginning with this author, we find them riming with *aigne*, *eigne* and *PRENDEAM; and the evidence collected in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXI, p. 671, shows that their pronunciation must have been *vîhe* and *têhe*. The explanation of this fact is difficult, but we see a similar development evident in the case of *iens* and *ient*; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 646 and 649. The unaccented *î* must have been absorbed by the following *ê*, a process which finds a parallel in modern *bê* and *vê* for *bien* and *viens*. When this had taken place, the orthography was altered accordingly, and we find *veigne* and *teigne*. This habit of pronunciation is evident in the *Escoufle*, *Roman de la Rose*, *Miracles de Notre Dame*, and persists as late as Villon; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 674-675.

The same coincidence of our two subjunctives with *aigne* and *eigne* is evident also in the *âne* territory, represented by such texts as *Ille et Galeron*, the poems of Chrestien de

Troies, *Guillaume de Palerne*, *Richars li Biaus*, and Philippe de Beaumanoir; cf. the rimes cited, l. c., p. 678. It is evident that *iēñe* has here followed the other syllables to *āñe*.

At the same time *iēñe* did not disappear, for there are other texts, such as the *Chev. II Esp.*, *Durmart*, *Galeran*, *Robert le Diable*, Froissart and others in which these verb forms are never paired with *aigne* and *eigne*. It is difficult to say whether this habit should be looked upon as a dialectic trait, but it should be noted that to a certain degree such difficult rimes as *pigne : ligne*, *Chev. II Esp.*, 4805, discussed above, fall into this list of texts.

Modern *vienne* and *tienne* are recent and probably based upon the present indicative; cf. Nyrop, *Gram.*, II, § 144.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

XIX.—*YSOPET III* OF PARIS.

I. INTRODUCTION.

Amongst the many collections of fables which have come down to us from the middle ages none appears to have enjoyed greater popularity or to have been more widely translated than that in Latin elegiac verse nowadays entitled the *Walter of England Collection*. In addition to an unusually large number of extant manuscript versions of this collection in its original form, more than one hundred being actually listed, there is a host of printed editions, while translations and adaptations are to be found in French, Italian, Provençal, Portuguese, Spanish, German, and Hebrew. Among so many reworkings but a single one occurs in French prose, and it is this collection, not hitherto printed, which forms the subject of the present article.

First of all let us take up for a moment the parent collection in Latin and briefly review its history, in order that we may have a clear idea of the exact place occupied by our particular collection in the fable literature of the middle ages.

a) *The Walter of England Collection*. Léopold Hervieux, in his monumental work, *Les Fabulistes latins*,¹ shows that with the exception of but two or three fables the *Walter of England Collection* is derived directly from the first three books of the *Romulus Vulgaris*,² which in turn comes from the *Romulus Primitivus*,³ which goes

¹ 7 vols., 2nd edition of Vols. I-II, Paris, 1893, ss. Cf. I, 472-668.

² Cf. Hervieux, I, 330-431; II, 195-233.

³ Cf. Hervieux, I, 293-327.

back to Phaedrus.¹ The other chief Latin derivatives of the *Romulus Vulgaris* are, in prose, the Romulus of Vincent de Beauvais,² Romulus of Corpus Christi College at Oxford,³ Romulus of Munich,⁴ Romulus of Berne,⁵ and in verse the collection of Alexander Neckam.⁶

For many years there was much and varied speculation with regard to the authorship of the collection, and even now the question can hardly be regarded as definitely settled, tho Hervieux gives the following not improbable hypothesis.⁷ Depending chiefly upon internal evidence contained in several of the oldest manuscripts, Hervieux affirms that the collection was written by one Walter of England, sometime chaplain of Henry the Second of England, and later Archbishop of Palermo. As chaplain to his majesty it fell to Walter's lot to direct the education of William the Good (or Young), Norman king of the Two Sicilies, who was betrothed to Henry's daughter Joanna. It is natural to suppose that the fables were composed in the discharge of this duty and that the appointment as archbishop was due to grateful recognition by the student of the good derived from the instruction. As the marriage took place in 1177, we may date the collection as of about 1175.

Such evidences of authorship as the foregoing are far from conclusive, but Hervieux's theory has been generally

¹ Cf. Thiele, *Illustrierter Lateinischer Aesop*, Leiden, 1905. Hervieux puts the *Aesopus ad Rufum* between the *Romulus Primitivus* and *Phaedrus*, cf. Hervieux, I, 267-292; II, 157-192.

² Cf. Hervieux, I, 432-460; II, 234-245.

³ Cf. Hervieux, I, 461-463; II, 246-261.

⁴ Cf. Hervieux, I, 464-468; II, 262-290.

⁵ Cf. Hervieux, I, 468-471; II, 302-315.

⁶ Cf. Hervieux, I, 668-684; II, 392-416.

⁷ Cf. Hervieux, I, 491-494.

accepted in lieu of a better one, and the collection is commonly known today as that of Walter of England.¹

The original collection of Walter's fables consisted of sixty fables in Latin distichs, with morals of two, rarely four, lines. As said above, the fables with but two exceptions are taken from the fifty-eight fables of the first three books of the *Romulus Vulgaris*, and, in many of the manuscripts, they are found in exactly the same order as the fables of that collection. The two exceptional fables, which are peculiar to Walter and his followers, are those of the Jew and Cup-bearer, and the Citizen and Soldier. It is only fair to Walter to state that while he followed the order and titles of his predecessor, he showed great originality in his choice of words and use of rhetorical figures, so that his fables easily stand first amongst medieval collections for both beauty of style and elegance of expression. In addition to the sixty fables already mentioned, several others came in time frequently to accom-

¹ An interesting reference of possible bearing upon this theory was recently brought to my attention by Dr. George C. Keidel, of the Johns Hopkins University, who showed me the following passage from the *Genealogia Deorum*, where Boccaccio says: "Et, ut deminoribus et me ipso sinam, audiui iam dudum illustrem uirum Jacobum desancto seuerino, tricarici et clarimontis comitem, dicentem se apatre habuisse suo, Robertum, karoli regis filium, postea inclitum ierusalem et sycilie regem, tam torpentis ingenij puerum fuisse, ut non absque maxima demonstrantis difficultate prima literarum elementa perciperet, et, cum fere de eo hac in parte amici desperarent omnes, pedagogi ingenium eius, solerti astutia rimantis fabellis esopi in tam grande studendi sciendique desiderium tractus est, ut breui non tantum domesticas has nobis liberales artes didicerit, uerum ad ipsa usque sacre phylosophie penetralia mira perspicacitate transiret; talemque dese fecisse regem, ut asalomone citra regum nemo doctiorem mortales agnouerint." (Book XIV. Cf. Hecker, *Boccaccio-Funde*, Braunschweig, 1902, p. 218). Robert the Wise, 1275-1343, succeeded his father, Charles II, as King of Naples in 1309.

pany the collection, two of them with such persistency that they gained a lasting place in many of the manuscripts and translations; these fables are those of the Wolf and Shepherd, and the Capon and Hawk.

The standard edition of the Latin text of the Walter of England collection is that published by Hervieux.¹ It is taken from a manuscript containing the sixty-two fables; an excellent edition of the sixty-fable form is that published by Foerster with his *Ysopet* of Lyons.² In addition to the full text of Walter's collection, Hervieux also prints the morals found in certain variant manuscripts, which differ from the usual form both in length and character.³

(b) *Derivatives of the Walter of England Collection.* Taking up now the redactions and translations of Walter's fables, we find already in Latin prose a reworking of twenty-nine fables of the collection, published by Hervieux as *Gualterianae Fabulae*; ⁴ and in other cases, as in the Harvard Aesop,⁵ the Latin distichs are accompanied by a running commentary in Latin prose and by an explanation of the same in Italian.

In Italy the fables were extremely popular, as is shown by the number of independent translations, not to mention "explanations" such as that of the Harvard Aesop just cited. The Italian collections derived from Walter are

¹ Cf. Hervieux, II, 316-351 (he publishes a text of the sixty-fable version in the first edition of Vol. II).

² Cf. Foerster, *Altfranzösische Bibliothek*, Bd. 5, *Lyoner Ysopet*, Heilbronn, 1892.

³ Cf. Hervieux, II, 352-365.

⁴ Cf. Hervieux, II, 383-391.

⁵ *Æsopi Fabulæ cum interpretatione vulgare: et figuris acri cura emendate*, Harvard University Library, Charles Eliot Norton Collection.

those known as the Per Uno da Siena,¹ Accio Zuccho,² Francesco del Tuppo,³ Riccardiano,⁴ Facio Caffarello,⁵ and *Apologhi Verseggiati*,⁶ the Per Uno da Siena Collection being one of the popular forms of Aesop's fables on sale in the bookshops today.

Translations or adaptations in other languages are the *Ysopet* of Vienna, a Portuguese collection recently published,⁷ the two-fable fragment in Provençal published by Pio Rajna in *Romania*,⁸ the eighteen fables of the Franco-Italian *Ysopet* published by the same scholar in the *Giornale de filologia romanza*,⁹ twenty-two of the twenty-seven fables found in the *Libro di Buen Amor*¹⁰ of Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita, and the Hebrew *Ysopite*.¹¹ In German, Boner's *Edelstein*¹² has certain of the fables, including the Jew and Cup-bearer and Citizen and Soldier, and a copy of Walter's text accompanies the Steinhöwel trans-

¹ For this and other Italian fable collections, cf. my edition of the *Isopo Laurenziano*, Columbus, Ohio, 1899 (Johns Hopkins Dissertation). The best editions of the Per Uno da Siena Collection are those published at Padua in 1811 and at Florence in 1864.

² MS. British Museum, Additional 10389; first edition, Verona, 1479; no modern edition.

³ First edition, Naples, 1485; no modern edition.

⁴ Published by Ghivizzani, *Il Volgarizzamento delle Favole di Galfredo, dette di Esopo*, Bologna, 1866, vols. 75-76 of *Scelta di Curiosità letterarie inedite o rare*.

⁵ Incunabulum edition: "Qui si tractano le fabule de Exopo, transmutate dal dicto latino in vulgare per Maestro Facio caffarello da faenza" (Cf. Hain, *Repertorium Bibliogr.*, No. 356).

⁶ Published by Monaci in *Rendiconti della Accademia dei Lincei*, Serie V, Vol. I (1892), pp. 666-681.

⁷ By Leite de Vasconcellos, *O Livro de Esopo*, Lisbon, 1906.

⁸ III, 291-294.

⁹ I, 13-42.

¹⁰ Ducamin edition, Toulouse, 1901.

¹¹ Cf. Steinschneider, *Jahrbuch für Romanische Literatur*, N.F., I, 4.

¹² *Der Edelstein* von Ulrich Boner, herausg. von F. Pfeiffer, Leipzig, 1844.

lation¹ of the *Romulus Vulgaris*, tho I have been unable to find any traces of its influence in the German. There are one or two collections of fables in the Stiftsbibliothek at St. Gall² which may be from Walter of England; and in Wolfenbüttel³ there is also a manuscript collection in German. In all of these derivatives, except the Italian, the correspondence with Walter's fables varies greatly; in many cases we find only the same general motifs reproduced.

In French, finally, there are the *Ysopet* of Lyons,⁴ the *Ysopet I* of Paris,⁵ and the hitherto unpublished collection of which I am about to speak in detail.

II. THE MANUSCRIPT.

The collection of fables of which the text follows is found in a small paper folio of the end of the fifteenth century,⁶ consisting of one hundred and one leaves, preceded by three blank leaves and followed by the same number, the whole handsomely bound in a leather binding of the sixteenth century with gilt edges. The manuscript is in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, where it is listed as No. 983, fonds français, having formerly borne the numbers MMCXCII, 816.1, and 7304. As to the provenience of the manuscript, a note at the end says: "Ce liure

¹ Cf. *Steinhöwels Aesop*, herausgegeben von H. Oesterley, Tübingen, 1873 (Printed for the Litterarischer Verein in Stuttgart).

² Manuscripts No. 625 and No. 643.

³ Walter von England, *Fabeln in Prosa*, Bibliothek Augusta, 81.16 Aug. 4to.

⁴ Published by Foerster in *Altfranzösische Bibliothek*, Vol. 5, Heilbronn, 1882.

⁵ Published by Robert, *Fables inédites des XII^e, XIII^e, et XIV^e Siècles et Fables de La Fontaine*, Paris, 1825.

⁶ Cf. L. Delisle, *Inventaire général et méthodique*, Paris. 1876. p. 62; Hervieux, i. 535-37, places it in the sixteenth century.

app(ar)tient a maistre P(ier)re Pantimer (or Paulmier) examine(ur) de p(ar) le Roy n(ost)re s(ir)e ou Chastellet de Pa(r)is." Furthermore, M. Ernest Quentin-Bauchart, in his work *La Bibliothèque de Fontainebleau et les Livres des Derniers Valois à la Bibliothèque nationale, 1515-1589*,¹ cites it amongst the manuscripts belonging to Charles IX, whose monogram is to be seen on the binding.

The contents of the manuscript, all of a distinctly moral tendency, are as follows:

- a. Méditations de la Sainte-Vierge sur la Passion.
- b. Le Trésor de la Sapience, par Jean Gerson.
- c. Moralités en vers.
- d. Des différentes natures de l'homme selon Aristote.
- e. Exposition des fables d'Esopé.

III. THE COLLECTION.

The collection of fables consists of forty-three fables in prose, each with its moral, and usually accompanied by an octosyllabic couplet resuming the central idea. There is nothing in the writing or the syntax of the text to indicate that it is the copy of an earlier version;² and as there is a heading "Cy com(m)ence l'exposicion des fables Ysopet" at the beginning and the word "Explicit" at the end, without any breaks in between, there is no reason to suppose that any part of the collection has been lost, even tho it is found at the end of a manuscript and is comparatively short. No mention is anywhere made of an author or copyist, and since, as will be seen

¹ Published at Paris by Paul, Huard et Guillemin, 1891; cf. p. 159.

² Unless the occasional confused readings, as in fables 28, 37, and 38, are taken as indications of a lost earlier version, rather than the translator's failure to understand his original.

later, the collection is derived from an anonymous original, I have entitled it simply "*Ysopet III* of Paris."

In seeking the origin of the fables of *Ysopet III*, it was most natural to look for relationship between this prose version and the other collections in French which had preceded it. A comparison with such collections showed no relationship whatsoever with the great collection of Marie de France, with the *Ysopet* of Chartres, *Ysopet II* of Paris, or with the fables of Vincent de Beauvais. On the other hand, the same fables, with but a single exception, appear in the *Ysopet* of Lyons,¹ and all of the fables, without exception, occur in *Ysopet I*.² As I have stated, both of these collections come directly from the Latin collection of Walter of England.³

Of the *Ysopet I* there are six manuscripts listed,⁴—four of them at Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français, Nos. 1594, 1595, 19123 and 24310; one at Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 11193; and one at London, British Museum, Additional 33781 (formerly Grenville XIII). Three of these manuscripts, Paris 1594, Brussels and London, are identical in the number, titles, illustrations, and order of the fables, and, according to Hervieux, at least the London and the Brussels manuscripts are by the same scribe. The Latin text accompanies the French in these three manuscripts only.

In comparing now the fables of *Ysopet III* with those of *Ysopet I*, I found exceedingly close correspondence in the relative order of the fables of the former and of the

¹ Cf. p. 499, fn. 4.

² *Ysopet I* is the collection published by Robert, cf. p. 499, fn. 5. *Ysopet II* is also published by Robert in the same work; it is not from the same source as *Ysopet I*.

³ Cf. p. 499.

⁴ Cf. Hervieux, I, 516-535, 571-574, 582-583.

fables of this threefold group of manuscripts just noted. In fact, beginning with Fable 5 of *Ysopet I*, The Dog and Shadow, *Ysopet III* follows the order of these three manuscripts with but a single break through Fable 49, The Battle between the Wolves and Sheep, the break being the omission in *Ysopet III* of the two fables of *Ysopet I*, No. 20, The Wolf and Sow, and No. 21, The Doves and Kite.

After noting this close correspondence in order between the fables of *Ysopet I* and *Ysopet III*, I compared the texts of the fables themselves, including in this comparison the Latin of Walter of England which is found with the fables of *Ysopet I* in the three manuscripts mentioned.¹ I found at once that the fables of *Ysopet I* are much expanded from the Latin version, and while actually new motifs are rarely if at all found, there are many minor differences to show that the composer felt free to take a good deal of liberty with his model. For example, the animals are often called by their proper names,—as Thiercelin, the Crow; Messires Bernart l'Arche prestre, the Ass; Sire Brichemers, the Stag; Madame Blance, the Sheep. In the fable of the Wolf and Crane, the Wolf, in order to get the bone out of his throat, sent far and wide for doctors and physicians, and from Montpellier there had come Madame Hauteve, the Crane, who had a license in physic. In the Swallow and Birds, in reply to the Swallow who is urging the birds to eat up the seed before it can grow into flax for the farmer to make nets

¹ This is the longer form of Walter's collection of which Hervieux (II, 352-382) publishes the morals and extra fables only, taking them from the Brussels manuscript cited above, Bibliothèque Royale, 11193. The text of *Ysopet I* used was that published by Robert, who followed the manuscript of Paris, No. 1594, fonds français, of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

of, the Lark says it is wrong to slander the farmer, and that the Swallow should go to Rome for absolution. In the Hares and Frogs, the Hares laughed so hard at the Frogs, who were frightened at them, that they split their mouths to the ears. Now in *Ysopet III* we find none of these slight variations, no proper names are used for the animals nor is the text drawn out and amplified with stories or moral observations. In all cases every motif found in *Ysopet III*, even every unusual substantive, such as the name of a particular article of food, has its correspondent in the Latin; so that at first sight it would seem that in *Ysopet III* we have a direct translation of Walter's fables, absolutely independent of *Ysopet I*; and this is, indeed, the opinion of Hervieux, who simply lists the manuscript as one containing fables from Walter of England.¹ However, contrary to his express statement, I find that the couplets occurring after thirty-five of our forty-three fables are in all but eight cases very closely paralleled by couplets from the corresponding fables of *Ysopet I*, and in these eight cases there is correspondence in sentiment if not in language.² Furthermore, the words used in *Ysopet III* to translate many of the expressions in the Latin are identical with those found in *Ysopet I*, and there is a sort of general similarity in ideas in the two French collections which shows a more or less intimate knowledge of *Ysopet I* by the composer of *Ysopet III*.

From the foregoing facts we may conclude that *Ysopet III* is a translation of the fables of Walter of England taken from a manuscript which contained both the Latin and *Ysopet I* in the order of the group of three manu-

¹ Cf. Hervieux, I, 536.

² Cf. the couplets from *Ysopet I* printed in footnotes to the fables of *Ysopet III*.

scripts above mentioned, Paris 1594, London and Brussels. The discrepancies in language between the couplets found in *Ysopet III* and the corresponding couplets of *Ysopet I* are too great to admit of the supposition that the former were taken from any one of the three manuscripts mentioned,¹ but there is enough difference between the readings in the manuscripts to enable us to suppose an older original, which may also very well have been the one used by the composer of *Ysopet III* and perhaps the one from which the other manuscripts of *Ysopet I* are derived. If this original were in fragmentary form, it might explain the variant order of the fables in the six manuscripts of that collection, and the omission in *Ysopet III* of Fables 1-4, 20-21, and 50-64 of *Ysopet I*.

¹ I have had access to the couplet readings in all three of these manuscripts, thanks to the courtesy of Mr. J. H. Stabler of the U. S. Legation at Brussels, and to that of Mr. Jedyes of the British Museum.

A TABLE TO SHOW THE CORRESPONDENCE IN FABLE-ORDER BETWEEN THE WALTER OF ENGLAND COLLECTION
AND ITS DERIVATIVES AND THE ROMULUS VULGARIS.

WALTER OF ENGLAND.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Ysopet I.	Ysopet III.	Ysopet of Lyons	Per Uno da Siena Acacio Zuccho Fr. del Tuppo.	Riccardiano.	Apologhi Verseg- giati.	Franco-Italian.	Provençal Fragments.	Ysopet of Vienna (Portuguese).	Arçipreste di Hita.	Boner's Edelstein.	Romulus Vulgaris.
1. Cock and Jewel.....	1	...	1	1	1	1	22	1	1
2. Wolf and Lamb.....	2	...	2	2	2	2	...	5	1
3. Rat and Frog.....	3	...	3	3	3	3	14	6	1
4. Dog and Sheep.....	4	...	4	4	4	4	...	7	1
5. Dog and Shadow.....	5	1	5	5	5	...	30	...	5	...	9	1
6. Lion's Share.....	6	2	6	6	6	6	...	8	1
7. Thief and Sun.....	7	3	7	7	7	7	...	10	1
8. Wolf and Crane.....	8	4	8	8	8	...	31	...	8	7	11	1
9. Two Bitches.....	9	5	9	9	9	1	9	...	12	1
10. Man and Serpent.....	10	6	10	10	10	2	10	...	13	1
11. Ass and Boar.....	11	7	11	11	11	3	11	...	14	1
12. Town Mouse and Country Mouse.....	12	8	12	12	12	4	12	21	15	1
13. Eagle and Fox.....	13	9	13	13	...	5	13	...	16	1
14. Eagle and Tortoise.....	14	10	14	14	13	6	14	...	17	1
15. Crow and Fox.....	15	11	15	15	14	7	31b.	...	15	26	18	1
16. Old Lion Sick.....	16	12	16	16	19	8	16	12	19	1
17. Ass and Lapdog.....	17	13	17	17	20	17	32	...	17	23	20	1
18. Lion and Mouse.....	18	14	18	18	21	18	18	25	21	1
19. Young Kite Sick.....	24	18	19	19	15	21	33	...	46	...	22	1
20. Swallow and Birds.....	25	19	20	20	16	47	15	23	1

WALTER OF ENGLAND.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Ysopet I.	Ysopet III.	Ysopet of Lyons.	Per Uno da Biens Accto Zuecho Fr. del Tuppo.	Riccardiano.	Apolophi Verseg- giati.	Franco-Italian.	Provençal Fragment.	Ysopet of Vienna (Portuguese).	Arçipreste de Hita.	Boner's Edelstein.	Romulus Vulgaris.
21. Frogs desiring King.....	19	15	21	{ 21 22	{ 17 22	{ 49 50	4	{ 24 25	11, 1
22. Doves and Kite.....	21	..	22	23	18	22	51	..	26	11, 2
23. Dog and Thief.....	22	16	23	24	23	23	34	..	52	3	27	11, 3
24. Wolf and Sow.....	20	..	24	25	24	53	18	28	11, 4
25. Mountain in Travail.....	23	17	25	26	25	54	2	29	11, 5
26. Lamb and Goat Mother.....	26	20	26	27	26	55	..	30	11, 6
27. Old Dog and Master.....	27	21	27	28	27	..	39	..	56	20	31	11, 7
28. Hares and Frogs.....	28	22	28	29	28	57	27	32	11, 9
29. Wolf and Kid.....	29	23	29	30	29	..	34b.	..	58	..	33	11, 10
30. Peasant and Serpent.....	30	24	30	31	30	59	19	34	11, 11
31. Stag, Wolf and Sheep.....	31	25	31	32	31	60	..	35	11, 12
32. Bald Man and Fly.....	32	26	32	33	32	19	35	..	18	..	36	11, 13
33. Fox and Stork.....	33	27	33	34	33	20	19	..	37	11, 14
34. Wolf and Mask.....	60	..	34	35	34	20	..	38	11, 15
35. Jay in Peacock's Feathers..	34	28	35	36	35	21	9	39	11, 16
36. Fly and Mule.....	35	29	36	37	36	22	..	40	11, 17
37. Ant and Fly.....	36	30	37	38	37	23	..	41	11, 18
38. Monkey Judge.....	37	31	38	39.	38	24	..	47	11, 19
39. Man and Weasel.....	38	32	39	40	39	25	11, 20
40. Frog and Ox.....	39	33	40	41	40	26	..	45	11, 21

WALTER OF ENGLAND.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
41. Lion and Shepherd.....	40	34	41	42	41	27	...	46	III, 1
42. Horse and Lion Doctor.....	41	35	42	43	42	...	40	...	28	10	50	III, 2
43. Horse and Ass.....	42	36	43	44	43	...	36	...	29	6	51	III, 3
44. Beasts and Birds.....	45	39	44	45	44	30	...	44	III, 4
45. Hawk and Nightingale.....	46	40	45	46	45	31	...	54	III, 5
46. Fox and Wolf.....	43	37	46	47	46	32	13	55	III, 6
47. Stag and Antlers.....	44	38	47	48	47	9	37	...	33	...	56	III, 7
48. Inconstant Widow.....	48	49	48	10	34	...	57	III, 9
49. Man and Harlot.....	49	50	49	11	35	III, 10
50. Father and Bad Son.....	50	51	50	12	36	III, 11
51. Serpent and Anvil.....	48	42	51	52	51	13	37	III, 12
52. Wolves and Sheep....	49	43	52	53	52	38	III, 13
53. Ax and Trees.....	50	...	53	54	53	14	39	III, 14
54. Wolf and Dog.....	51	...	54	55	54	15	40	...	59	III, 15
55. Belly and Members.....	52	...	55	56	55	41	...	60	III, 16
56. Monkey and Fox.....	53	...	56	57	56	16	42	III, 17
57. Merchant and Ass.....	54	...	57	58	57	...	38	...	43	III, 18
58. Stag and Oxen.....	55	...	58	59	58	44	III, 19
59. Jew and Cup-bearer.....	58	...	59	60	59	45	...	61
60. Citizen and Soldier.....	60	61	60	61	...	62
61. Capon and Hawk.....	56	62	61	62
62. Wolf and Shepherd.....	57	63	62	63

IV. TEXT.

NOTE.—In preparing the text of *Ysopet III* for publication, the following points have been observed: the manuscript has been followed very closely and, in the few cases where alterations or omissions have been made, the changes appear in italics and the original reading has been given in the footnotes; the abbreviations, in no case unusual, have been developed; the text has been capitalized and punctuated, and accents have been introduced where necessary to distinguish the correct form of certain words; no account has been taken of different forms of the same letter, such as *u* and *v*, *i* and *j*. The interpretation of the forms offers no especial difficulty, as the text contains no peculiarities uncommon to Old French texts in general; with the exception of occasional dialect forms such as *biaux* and *fromaige*, the language is French throughout.

CY COMMENCE L'EXPOSICION DES FABLES YSOPET.

1. Du Chien qui passoit l'Eaue et portoit une Piece de Chair.

Le chien passoit une riviere et portoit en sa gueulle une piece de chair, et quant il fut sur l'eaue il vit au fons l'ombre de sa piece de chair, et pour convotise de l'avoir il ouvrit la gueulle pour happer l'ombre de sa piece de chair, et elle luy eschappa, ainsi il la perdit.

Moralité.

On ne doit point lesser les choses qu'on a possedees seurement et par longtemps pour cuider avoir plus grans choses non seures; car qui convoite il se met en danger de perdre tout, comme la vielle qui ne fut pas contente de soy seoir sur une selle, mes voulut seoir sur deux, et elle cheut et fut sans selle.

Celluy pert tout qui tout convoite
Ceste raison est assez droicte.

Fol. 75a.

1. Dog and Shadow.

Ysopet I, 5, ll. 17-18: Tout pert cil qui l'autrui convoite
Ceste raison est assez droite.

2. De la Chievvre, la Brebiz, la Genice et du Lyon
qui s'entreencompagnerent.

Jadiz la brebiz, la genice, la chievvre et le lyon / fol. 75b/ s'entrecompagnerent et firent alliances ensemble, en promectant foy les ungs aux autres. Si advint qu'ilz prindrent ung cerf, et quant ilz le voudrent deppartir entre eulx, le lion dist: "Je suis roy et seigneur des bestes, et pour ce je doy avoir por honneur la premieré partie, et la seconde je vueil avoir pour ce que je suis le plus fort, et pour ma paine je vueil avoir la tierce, et la quarte, qui la voudra, il la me osterà a force."

Moralité.

Il n'affiert pas a ung homme de bas et petit estat de soy acompareir ne estre pareil a son seigneur, et vault mieulx estre content de la compagnie de son pareil, et est chose plus seure et plus durable, car qui se compare a gregneur de luy, il luy en meschet de leger, pour ce que le plus fort veult tous jours avoir le droit et retenir le millieur, tous jours par devers luy le foible ne luy ose contredire, ne peult aussi.

Ferme amour et grant seigneurie
Ne s'entrefont point compagnie.

2. Lion's Share.

Ysopet I, 6, ll. 31-32: Ferme amour et grant seigneurie
Estre ensemble ne sieulent mie.

3. De la Femme qui se maria a ung Larron.

/fol. 76a/

Une femme se maria a ung larron, de quoy ses voysins s'esjouyrent tous, excepté ung saige qui les en reprint et leur mist une exemple du souleil, qui pieça fiança femme, de quoy la terre se complaingnoit a Dieu, en disant qu'elle ne peut endurer la chaleur du souleil, et s'il prent femme, il engendera ung aultre souleil, et elle sera toute arse et brullee. "Ainsi, dist le saige, si le larron engendre ung autre larron, il nous pourra a tous mescheoir."

Moralité.

Par ceste exemple nous est monstéré que nous devons fouyr les mauvais et haÿr leur compagnie, pour ce que nous n'en pouons que piz valloir; et nous doit desplaire de ce que il en est tant.

Qui mal fait ou qui mal veult faire,
Sa compagnie a nully ne doit plaire.

3. Thief and Sun.

Ysopet I, 7, ll. 21-22: Qui mal fait ne qui mal doit faire,
Il ne doit a nul homme plaire.

4. De la Grue qui garit le Loup.

Le loup fut ennossé tellement qu'il fut en peril de mort et ne pouoit trouver remede. La grue, qui en eust pitié, dist que s'il la /fol. 76b/ vouloit bien paier, qu'elle gariroit. Le loup fut tres bien joieulx et luy promist qu'il la paieroit tres bien, s'elle garissoit. La grue bouta son bec dedans

la gueulle du loup et tira l'os de quoy il estoit enossé. Quant le loup se sentit gary et la grue voulut estre payee, il ne tint compte d'elle, mes luy dist: " Tu es tenue moult a moy, et me doiz sçavoir bon gre de ce que je t'ay saulvé la vie, car, quant tu boutas ta teste dedans ma gueulle, si j'eusse voulu, je t'eusse rompu le col."

Moralité.

Quant on fait courtoisie a ung mauvais homme qui est en danger ou en adversité, il ne tient compte puis après de ceulx qui luy ont fait le bien, et ne leur en scet nul gre, mes leur fait entendant qu'il leur a fait autres foiz plaisir et qu'ilz sont encores bien tenuz a luy.

Bien faire a mauvais rien ne vault,
Tost l'oublie et ne luy en chault.

4. Wolf and Crane.

Ysopet I, 8, ll. 29-30: Bien faire a mauvais riens ne vault;
Tost l'oublie et ne li en chault.

5. Des deux Chiennes.

Une chienne plaine de cheneaulx qui n'avoit lieu ou elle peust chienner, si prya a une /fol. 77a/ autre chienne qu'elle luy vouldist prester sa maison jusques a ce qu'elle eust chienné. L'autre chienne yst de sa maison et fist entrer celle qui vouloit chienner; et quant elle fut dedans et qu'elle eust chienné, elle ne vouldit oncques puis yssir, mes dist a celle qui avoit presté sa maison qu'elle n'y enteroit ja, et luy chassa tres rudement et la menassa de luy faire desplaisir et de la mordre, s'elle approchoit de sa maison. Celle qui remede n'y peut mettre s'en alla ailleurs querir maison toute courrossee.

Moralité.

On se doit garder et estre advisé qu'on ne soit deceu par parolles faintes, doulces et amyables, come fut la chienne qui perdit sa maison et come l'oyseau qui est prins et deceu par le doulx chant de l'oyselleur, et aussi ceulx qui sont en la mer qui sont deceuz et perilz par le doulx chant de la sirainne.

5. Two Bitches.

Ysopet I, 9.

6. Du Villain qui heberga le Serpent.

En yver qu'il faisoit grant froit, le villain trouva es champs ung serpent engellé et /fol. 77b/ mortifié de froidure, et en eust pitié et le print et l'emporta en sa maison et le fist chauffer et aiser. Quant le serpent fut bien chauffé et eust recouvert sa force, il commença a siffler et a gecter et espandre son velin par my la maison du villain; et le villain s'en courrossa et le vult mettre hors et luy dist qu'il s'en allast sans retourner. Le serpent *n'en* * voulut rien faire, et le villain le vult frapper, et il le mort et mist ledict villain en peril de mort.

Moralité.

Ceulx qui rendent mal pour bien et velin pour miel ressemblent le serpent. Car la souriz qui est portee en escharpe, quant elle a mengé la viande qui est dedans, après elle rompt et dessire l'escharpe, et le feu qui est † au giron † brulle ce que est entour, et le serpent qui est porté au *giron* § mort celui qui le porte.

Ainsi rendent les mauvais tuit
Mal pour bien et paine pour pourfit.

6. Man and Serpent.

* MS. *n'* inserted before *en* for sense.

† MS. *nuise* after *est*.

‡ MS. *qui* after *giron*.

§ MS. reads *au mort* without *giron*.

Ysopet I, 10, ll. 19-20: Ainsi rendent les mauvais tuit
Mal pour bien et paine pour fruit.

7. De l'Asne qui salue le Sanglier.

L'asne jadiz encontra le sanglier, si print le /fol. 78a/
hardement de le saluer en riant, et se jouant luy dist par
priveté: "Dieu te gard, beau frere." Le sanglier, qui est
fier et orgueilleux, fut meu de luy courre sus et de l'affoller,
cy ne feust la noblesse et grandeur de luy au regard de
l'asne, povre et ville beste; et se reffraingnit et ne luy fist
nul mal.

Moralité.

Le saige ne doit point courrocer quant le fol se joue et
parle mains reveremment qu'il ne deust, mes n'en doit
tenir compte; et aussi le fol ne doit point jouer au saige,
ne le povre au riche, car, qui se veult jouer, il doit querir
son pareil, et ainsi en son jeu ne peut rien perdre.

On doit jouer a son semblable,
Se nous enseigne ceste fable.

7. Ass and Boar.

Ysopet I, 11, ll. 19-22: Nuns ne doit si haut encroer
Soy a plus fort de lui jouer
S'efforçoit mes a son semblable,
Se nous ensaigne ceste fable.

8. De la Souriz de la Bonne Ville et de Celle des Champs.

La souriz des champs donna a disner a celle de la bonne ville en sa petite maisonnecte, et combien qu'il y eust petit lieu et pou de viandes, toutes foiz le faisoit-elle de bon cuer, /fol. 78b/ et mengerent joieusement en seureté. Depuis celle de la bonne ville donna a disner a celle des champs en la despence d'un riche home, bien garnie de diverses viandes. Et ainsi qu'elles mengoient, le despancier survint, qui ouvrit l'uys et entra en la despence. Et aussi tost que celle de la bone ville, qui sçavoit la coustume de soy muser, ouÿt ouvrir l'uys, elle s'enfouyt. L'autre souriz demoura esbaÿe et ne sçavoit ou aller; d'aventure se harpa contre le mur ou elle se tint a grant peine, tremblant de paour jusques a ce que le despancier s'en fut allé. Adonc l'autre souriz retourna pour menger et dist a celle des champs qu'elle mengast et fist bone chere et ne s'esbaÿst de rien, et que c'estoit la coustume. Celle qui * trembloit encore de paour come c'elle eust eu les fievvres, n'eust plus cure de menger, mes dist: "Je ne vueil plus cy demourer, je ne tiens compte ne † moy cure de tes viandes ne de ta grant maison, j'ayme mieulx estre aux champs en ma petite maisonnecte et menger des fevves a seureté, joyeuse et sans danger, que toutes tes viandes et estre tous jours en paour et sans plaisance ne seureté."

Moralité.

L'estat d'un pouvre qui a suffissance et vit /fol. 79a/ joieusement et prent en gre ce qu'il a, vault mieulx et est plus a louer que l'estat d'un riche qui habonde en biens et richesses et est tous jours en doubte et mal seur, triste et sans plaisance et en peril.

Mieulx vault fevves menger en liesse,
Qu'abondance viande, paoureux en tristesse.

8. Town Mouse and Country Mouse.

* MS. *te* erased at end of line after *qui*.

† MS. *ny* erased after *ne*.

Ysopet I, 12, ll. 61-65: Plus am mes feves, douce seur,
Asseur et a pais de mon cuer.
Que de viandes habundance,
Et fusse tousjours en doutance,
Et en péeur et en pensée.

9. Du Regnart et de l'Aigle.

L'aigle, qui est le roy de tous les oyseaulx, si print au regnart ung de ses petiz regnardeaux pour paistre ces petiz. Le regnart en fut courrocé, se mist en peine de le ravoïr et le prya qu'il luy pleust a le luy rendre. L'aigle luy dist qu'il n'en feroit riens. Le regnart, qui scet trop de malice, voyant son enffant en peril de mort et ne le pouoit avoir par priere ne beau parler, si bouta le feu au pié de l'abre ou estoit le nic pour eschauffer de fumee les aigleaux qui estoient dedans, et quant l'aigle les vit en peril, elle ayma mieulx rendre le regnardeau qu'elle perdist ses aigleaux.

Moralité.

Par ceste fable peult-on veoir que le riche /fol. 79b/ et puissant par force et puissance peut grever le povre, et pour ce, qui a aucune chose a mauvaiz tiltre et contre raison, vault mieulx lesser aller a qui elle doit estre que se mettre en peril de perdre plus grant chose en la voulant retenir.

Aucunes foiz le victorieux
Du vaincu rechet *es lieux*.*

9. Eagle and Fox.

* *MS. et reclus.*

Ysopet I, 13, ll. 29-30: A la fois li victorieus
Du vaincu rechiet *es lieux*.

10. De l'Aigle et de la Limace.

L'aigle portoit en son bec une lymace et avoit grant desir de la menger, mes elle ne pouoit pour ce que la limace c'estoit musee dedans sa coquille. La corneille, qui vit ce, dist a l'aigle: "Il a dedans ceste coquille tres bone viande, mes on ne la peut avoir sans rompre la coquille, je te conseille que tu la lesses cheoir a terre sur une pierre, elle se rompra tantost." L'aigle la creut et lessa cheoir la coquille, quĩ rompit, et la corneille s'avence et mengea la lymace avant que l'aigle y peust advenir.

Moralité.

On peut veoir par cest exemple que on est /fol. 80a/ souvent deceu par croire mauvaiz conseil, et pour ce on ne doit pas croire de leger tout ce que on conseille, qui ne congnoist bien ceulx qui donnent le bon conseil, car, qui le fait, il luy en meschet souvent.

10. Eagle and Slug.

Ysopet I, 14.

11. Du Regnart et du Corbeau.

Le regnart avoit fain et queroit proye, si vit ung corbeau qui tenoit en son bec ung fromaige, et eust grant

fain de l'avoir, cy luy dist: " Sire corbeau, vous avez ung chant tres gracieux et plaisant, et ressemblez tres bien a vostre feu pere qui fut tres bon chantre, et devriez encore mieulx chanter que luy; et croy que si vous chantiez, que a la douceur de vostre chant vous assembleriez les oyseaulx de ce boys." Le corbeau s'en glorifia et s'en orgueillit, et creut le regnart et ne s'apperceut pas de ce que le regnart le vouloit decevoir, cy commança a chanter, son fromaige luy cheut a terre, et le regnart le print et le menga.

Moralité.

Les folz plains de vaine gloire qui cuident valoir et sçavoir plus qu'ilz ne sont, et desirent /fol. 80b/ avoir louenge et honneur qui ne leur appartient pas, et se lessent decevoir par belles parolles, si s'en trouvent deceuz, et leur en vient souvent perte, honte et villennye.

Qui vaine gloire quiert et chasse,
Sa honte et sa perte pourchasse.

11. Fox and Crow.

Ysopet I, 15, ll. 29-30: Qui vaine glorie croist et chasce.
Sa perte et sa honte pourchasse.

12. Du Lyon qui cheut en Viellesse et n'avoit fait nulz Amys.

Ung lion, qui en sa jeunesse fut fort orgueilleux et hardi, devint viel et impotent, et tellement qu'il perdit sa force et ne se pouoit plus aider. Le sanglier, a qui il avoit fait maintes foiz desplaisir et batu et navré, quant il le vit en tel point, il s'en revencha, car il le batit et le navra parellement, et le torreau le hurta de ses cornes et blessa moult

fort, et l'asne le batoit et hurtoit de sa teste. Le lion, qui n'a pouoir de soy revenger, commence fort a plourer: " Helas, chetif! ceulx que j'ay maintes foiz vaincu et surmonté et de qui je ne tenoie compte, maintenant me desprissent et me batent, je n'ay mes pouoir de me venger, car, puis que /fol. 81a/ j'ay perdu ma force et suis sans amys, je n'avray jamès honneur ne joie, mes me convient vivre en doulleur et en tristesse; cy plussieurs foiz eusse eu pitié de ceulx qui me font desplaisir, ilz eussent pitié de moy."

Moralité.

Ceulx, qui en leur prosperité, en leur force et puissance n'acquierent nulz amys, sont en peril de vivre en la misere et malleureté du lyon; car, tant come l'omme est en prosperité, il ne peut congnoistre ses amys, pour ce que chascun luy veult complaire pour amender de luy, mes quant il est en adversité, chascun le fuyt excepté les vraiz amys; et pour ce, quant on est en puissance, on doit acquerir des amys.

Celluy n'a mye sa vie seure,
Qui de faire amys n'a cure.

12. Old Lion Sick.

Ysopet I, 16, ll. 27-28: Bien se gart de ceste aventure
Cil qui de faire amis n'a cure.

13. De l'Asne et du Chien qui veullent complaire a leur Maistre.

Ung riche homme avoit ung chien qu'il aymoît moult pour ce que le chien luy faisoit plussieurs esbatemens, aussi les serviteurs du riche home /fol. 81b/ aymoient le chien pour ce que leur maistre y prenoit plaisance, si luy

donnoient tous jours a menger. L'asne, qui vit ce, dist a luy-mesmes: " Je suis trop plus proffitable a mon maistre et ne tient l'en compte de moy, car je porte souvent de pesans faiz, et le chien ne sert rien que flater; je vueil faire comme luy." L'asne vint a son maistre, qui seoit a table, et balloit la queue et gémissoit le plus hault qu'il pouoit pour cuider complaire a son maistre. Cy commança a cryer les serviteurs, lesquels vindrent a grant haste et hosterent l'asne et le batirent tres fort et le chasserent villennement.

Moralité.

Quant le fol ce veult entremectre de faire ce que ne luy appartient; et qu'il ne sçavroit ne pourroit faire, et a quoy il n'est pas habille par nature, et il cuide plaire et il ne prent plaisir a chose qu'il face, mes ennuye a chascun, si luy en meschet, il est bien employé et ne le doit nul plaindre.

Celluy est fol qui s'entente et sa cure
Met a avoir ce que luy vee nature. /fol. 82a/

13. Ass and Lap-dog.

Ysopet I, 17, ll. 46-48: Pour ce vous dis que cil est fos
Qui, en ce avoir met sa cure
Qui vée il est de nature.

14. Du Lyon et de la Souriz.

Le lyon, qui estoit las et travaillé, dormoit en my les boys quant les souriz, qui se jouoient, l'esveillèrent par la noise qu'elles firent. Il en happa une; elle luy crya mercy tantost, affin qu'il ne la tuast. Le lion, regardant la petisse d'elle et la grandeur de luy, se rappaisa et dist: " Si j'avoie

tué ceste meschante sourriz, je n'y avroie point de louenge, mes me seroit imputé a honte et villennie, et en seroie moins prisé." Si le lessa aller sans luy mal faire. La sourriz s'en alla a grant joie et remercia le lion de sa courtoisie, en luy disant que si le cas advenoit, qu'elle luy rendroit le plaisir. Et ne demourra guiere de temps après que le lion fut prins en ung rayz et en peril de mort, s'il n'eust eu secours de la sourriz a qui il souvenoit du temps passé, et rongea les raiz aux dents et delivra le lion et le garda de mourir.

Moralité.

Combien que ung grant et puissant sengneur ait pouvoir de grever le pouvre, si ne le doit-il pas faire, mes luy doit faire plaisir et courtoisie, car s'il luy fait desplaisir, il n'y avra ja honneur, mes en seroit moins prisé /fol. 82b/ et aymé; et pourroit venir qu'il vendroit en adversité et avroit besoing de l'ayde de cellui a qui il avroit fait desplaisir au temps passé, qui luy pourroit ayder et saulver la vie.

On ne fist oncques courtoisie
Qui en aucun temps ne soit mercye.

14. Lion and Mouse.

Ysopet I, 18, ll. 59-60: Bien ne vit oncques courtoisie
Communement ne soit mercie.

15. Des Raynes qui vouloient avoir ung Roy.

Ung temps fut que les raynes estoient en tel franchise et seureté que nul ne leur pouoit nuyre ne grever. Elles ne pouoient durer de l'aise qu'elles avoient mes prièrent Dieu qu'elles eussent ung roy. Dieu n'en fist compte et n'en fist que rire. Elles prièrent de rechef Dieu et Dieu lessa cheoir ung tref en l'eaue, qui les

espouenta au cheoir, et se misdrent au fons de l'eaue. Et quant l'eaue fut rapaisée, elles vindrent sus et monterent sur le tref et cuidoiēt que ce feust leur roy; et quant elles furent dessus et sentirent qu'il ne se mouvoit, elles n'en furent pas contentes, /fol. 83a/ et prièrent Dieu la tierce foys qu'il leur envoyast roy. Adonc Dieu se courroça et leur envoya ung serpent, qui commença a les menger et destruire. Adonc elles furent esbaÿes et ne voudrent plus de roy, et firent leur complainte a Dieu qu'il leur ostast, qu'elles n'avoient plus cure. Et Dieu leur respondit: " Puis que vous n'avez voulu souffrir que je vous lessasse en paix, mes avez voulu avoir roy, il vous tiendra en subjection et vous mangera et destruira a son plaisir, et demourez doresenavant en servitude et serez tous jours en doubte et en paour."

Moralité.

Ceulx qui sont en franchise et ont leur vie sans danger selon ce qu'il leur appartient, et ne se scevënt tenir mes lessent l'estat et la maniere de vivre ou ilz se congnoissent pour prendre ung autre ou ilz ne se congnoïssent, cuidant par ce venir a plus grant bien, se il leur en vient mal, il est bien employé et ne les doit-on pas plaindre.

Bien qui dure ne prise rien,
Par mal avoir le scet on bien. /fol. 83b/

15. Frogs desiring King (Tree and Frogs).

Ysopet I, 19, ll. 31-32: Bien qui dure n'est prisiez rien
Par le mal cognoist-on le bien.

16. Du Chien et du Larron.

Ung larron, qui vouloit par nuyt desrober ung hostel, vint au chien et luy donna une piece de pain, affin qu'il

se teust. Mes le chien le reffusa et luy dist: "Tu me veulx donner ce pain affin que je me taise et que tu des robes l'ostel de mon maistre, et je n'en feray rien, car, si je mengoie ce pain a heure qu'il n'est pas temps de menger, je pourroye mourir au temps advenir; tu me veulx decevoir. Je ne traÿray pas mon maistre, car, pour ce qu'il se fye plus en moy que en ceulx qu'il ne congnoist, il m'a baillé a garder son hostel. Va-t'en ou je t'abayeray, car je suis content et me souffist de ce que mon maistre me donne." Le larron n'en tint' compte jusques a ce que le chien abbaye, qui l'en fist aller.

Moralité.

Se on te veult aucune chose donner a part et secretement, et que celui qui te veult donner n'est de rien tenu a toy, tu ne le doiz pas recevoir, car c'est affin que soies consentant que on face par ton moien aucune chose qui au temps advenir porteroit a toy et autruy tres grant dommage, et y pourroys trop perdre. /fol. 84a/

S'on te donne, regarde quoy,
Qui se'est, a quel fin et pour quoy.

16. Dog and Thief.

Ysopet I, 22, ll. 27-28: Se on te donne, regarde quoy
Qui est qui donne et pourquoy.

17. De la Terre qui enfanta une Souriz.

Jadiz en une champaigne et plat pays la terre enfla et fist une montaige qui se haussa tellement que les gens s'assemblerent touz esbaïz et cuiderent estre touz perilz, et cuidoient que ce feust signifiencie de grans maulx

advenir. Mes ilz s'esbaÿrent pour neant, car la terre enffanta une souriz seullement et ce desemfla.

Moralité.

On voit communement que *est* * le fait de ceulx qui sont grans vendeurs et qui par leur grant parler font esbaÿr les gens, et viennent a neant come la terre qui est desenflee pour enffanter une souriz, et pour ce dit-on le proverbe commun, *les montaignes ont enffanté une souriz*.

17. Mountain which brought forth Mouse.

Ysopet I, 23.

* *Est* inserted for sense.

18. Du Filz de l'Escouffle qui fut malade. /fol. 84b/

Ung escouffleau estoit malade et requist sa mere qu'elle voulsist prier Dieu pour luy. Mes l'escouffle luy dist: "Beau filz, Dieu te pugnist maintenant des grans maulx que tu as fait et te rend le loyer que tu as desservy, mal pour mal. Car,* quant tu estoies sain, cy tu eusses aymé Dieu et qu'il te feust souvenu de luy et tu te feusses gardé de mal faire; † et la repantance que tu as maintenant ne te vient pas du cuer ne de la volenté que tu ayes de toy amender, mes de paour que tu as de mourir et pour estre gary seullement; et pour ce Dieu ne tient compte de priere qu'on face pour toy, mais te lerra mourir."

Moralité.

Qui est en peché mortel et aucunement ne amende sa vie et ne luy souvient de Dieu, s'il † est en maladie et il n'a vraie contrition et repentence de ses pechez, pour neant prie-on Dieu pour luy, car il se lesse perdre et estre dampné sans fin.

Qui de vray cuer ne se repent,
S'il pryé Dieu, il ne l'entend. /fol. 85a/

18. Young Kite Sick.

Ysopet I, 24, has no corresponding couplet, tho the tone of the moral is similar.

* MS. after *car a t* is erased.

† A phrase is evidently omitted after *faire*.

‡ MS. *s'* inserted before *il* for clearness.

19. De l'Arondelle et des autres Oyseaulx.

L'arrondelle vit que le villain avoit semé ung champ de lin et pence que on en pourroit après faire raiz a prendre oyseaulx, si vint aux autres oyseaulx et leur dist, mes ilz n'en tindrent compte. Quant le lin fut beau, elle leur dist encore et advisoit qu'il y falloit mettre remede et destruire le lin ou autrement il leur mescherroit. Les oyseaulx n'en tindrent compte emplus que devant. L'arrondelle commança a parler au villain et l'aymoit moult, et quant le lin fut grant on fist des raiz ausquelx on print plussieurs des autres oyseaulx.

Moralité.

Celui qui voit les choses advenir et donne conseil pour remedier aux inconveniens qui puent advenir, et on ne le veult croire, s'il en meschet après a ceulx qui ne l'ont voulu croire, il est bien employé, et ne les doit-on pas plaindre.

Qui a son sens trop se asseure,
Et il luy meschet, nul ne le pleure. /fol. 85b/

19. Swallow and Birds.

Ysopet I, 25, ll. 42-44: Celui doit bien estre punis

Qui en son san par troup s'assure

Et qui de bon conseil n'a cure.

20. Du Loup et de l'Aignel.

Le loup, qui tous jours pense mal, s'en vint a ung jeune aigneau, lequel une chievre nourrissoit, et luy dist: "Tu es fol de toy tenir avec ceste orde beste, lesse-moy ceste chievvre et t'en vien avecques moy, je te mettray avecques ta mere qui te garde son piz plain de let." L'aigneau, comme bien advisé, ne le creut pas, mes lui dist: "Tu me cuides decepvoir, je n'en feray riens, j'ayme mieulx estre seul et demourer avec ceste chievvre qui me nourrist aussi doucement come s'elle estoit ma mere, que la lesser pour aller avecques toy querir * ma mere, et puis tu me mengeroys et feroys dommaige a mon maistre, qui me nourrist pour ma toyson."

Moralité.

Ceulx semblent le loup qui mettent peine a decevoir les bons et les simples par bourdes, et mensongent et leur promectent qu'ilz leur feront plaisir et courtoisie, et les destruisent et leur font aucunes foiz perdre la vie, et pour ce on ne les doit pas croire pour leur beau parler. /fol. 86a/

Du faulx conseil, maleureté,
Et du bon, pays et † seureté.

20. Lamb and Goat Mother.

* MS. Abbreviation for *mere* scratched out after *querir*.

† MS. *la*.

Ysopet I, 26, ll. 45-48: Mauvais conseil peut troup grever
Pour ce le doit-on eschever
Du mauvais, vient malhureté
Et du bon, pais et seureté.

21. Du Chien qui cheoit en Viellesse.

Ung paisant avoit ung beau chien qu'il aymoît moult et tenoit cher tant qu'il estoit fort et jeune et qu'il luy

pouoit faire plaisir et porter prouffit; mes il fut vieulx et usé qu'il ne se pouoit plus aider et n'en tint plus compte, et quant le chien venoit a luy il le chassoit. Quant le chien vit ce, il dist: " Helas! quant j'estoie fort et jeune et bien courant, et prenoie les lievvres au cours et desconfisoye les plus fortes bestes sauvaiges, j'estoie cher tenu, prisé et aymé, et maintenant, pour ce que je suis viel et usé et ne puis porter prouffit, on ne tient compte de moy, et ay esté fol et mal conseillé que en ma jeunesse je n'ay esparagné pour vivre en ma viellesse et estre hors de danger." /fol. 86b/

Moralité.

Tant comme on est fort et jeune et que on peut porter prouffit, on tient compte des gens et les ayme l'en, mes quant ilz sont vieulx et ne se puent plus aider ne porter prouffit, on les deboute et chasse, et n'en tient-on plus compte.

21. Old Dog and Master.
Ysopet I, 27.

22. Des Lievvres qui s'enfuyrent.

Les arbres d'une forrest trembloient et se demainnoient, par quoy les lievvres qui estoient dedans s'enfuyrent espouentés, et s'en vindrent a une grant mare et n'oserent entrer dedans, mes se arresterent, et les raynes se muserent au fons de l'eaue. Ung des lievvres commança a dire: " Nous ne sommes pas seulz qui avons paour et sommes couars,* ses raynes nous doubtent tant qu'elles se mussent † au fons de l'eaue; nous avons paour de neant." Adonc ilz dirent: " Prenons hardement et passons oultre la mare."

Moralité.

Quant on est en aucun grant peril de son estat ou de sa vie, combien qu'on soit espouenté, /fol. 87a/ si ne ce doit-on pas lesser perdre par paour et lascheté, mes prendre hardement en soy et couraige pour vaincre ces ennemys et adversaires; car plussieurs, qui ont esté en grant peril d'estre mort, sont retournez en leur premier estat et saulvé leur vie par avoir en eulx bonne esperance et hardement.

Tel est saulvé par esperance,
Qui de mourir fut en doubance.

22. Hares and Frogs.

* MS. *cqruars*.

† MS. *er* erased after *muss*.

Ysopet I, 28, ll. 35-36: Tel est sauvé par esperance
Qui de morir fust en doutance.

23. De la Chievvre et du Loup.

La chievvre s'en alla en pasture et enferma son filz, le chevvreau, en une estable, et luy dist qu'il ne ouvrist l'uys jusques a ce qu'elle retornast. Et quant elle fut partie, le loup vint a l'uys et commença a hurter et braire, en faingnant que ce feust la chievvre, pour entrer en l'estable. Le chievvreau, a qui il souvenoît de ce que sa mere luy avoit dit: "Je ne te ouvriray ja l'uys, car j'entens bien a ta voix que tu /fol. 87b/ n'es pas ma mere, et aussi je te voy par le trou de l'uys, cy t'en va."

Moralité.

Les jeunes enffans qui sont songneux de retenir les bons enseignemens de leurs parens et obeissent a eulx, ceulx viennent a bien et honneur et leur prent bien de leur

affaire, et, au contraire, ceulx qui ne le veullent retenir, seront meschans et finiront mal leurs jours.

L'enffant a grant estat et honneur vient,
Quant du pere la doctrine retient.

23. Wolf and Kid.

Ysopet I, 29, ll. 25-27: Pour ce, vous dis qu'en l'enfant vient
Grant preu, quant il voit et retient
La bonne doctrine du père.

24. Du Villain qui nourrit le Serpent.

Le villain nourrit par long temps ung serpent et le tenoit en la main et paissoit, tant estoit privé de luy. Si advint ung jour qu'il se courroça au serpent et print une congnee et l'en frappa et batit. Depuis /fol. 88a/ il vint a povreté, et cuida que ce feust parce qu'il avoit batu le serpent, et s'en repentit et luy crya mercy. Mes le serpent luy dist que tant qu'il tenroit la congnee qu'il ne luy pardonnoit de bon cuer, ne se firoit en luy, s'il ne la lessoit. Le villain lessa la congnee et luy crya mercy, et le serpent luy pardonna.

Moralité.

Quant aucun a fait desplaisir a ung autre, on ne se doit point fier en luy ne s'en tirer pres ne le converser, jusques a ce qu'il soit bien apaisé et qu'on ait bone asseurance de luy, et est expedient que a telz gens on se garde d'eulx.

Avec celuy que tu as blecé,
Ne te tiens, s'il n'est rappaisé.

24. Man and Serpent.

Ysopet I, 30, has no corresponding couplet.

25. Du Cerf, de la Brebiz et du Loup.

Le cerf demandoit a la brebiz, en la presence du loup, ung boesseau de blé, qu'elle luy /fol. 88b/ devoit, et luy demanda incontinant pour et ne souffrit pas qu'elle s'en excussast. La brebiz, qui doubtoit que le loup ne la mengeast, ne luy osa contredire, mais dist qu'elle ne l'avoit pas presentement et qu'il luy pleust donner terme et elle luy payroit, et le cerf luy actorda. Quant le terme fut escheu, le cerf demanda son ble a la brebiz, et elle luy dist qu'elle ne luy paieroit ja, car elle luy avoit promis par paour et contrainte et qu'elle n'y estoit de rien tenue.

Moralité.

On n'est point tenu ne obligé selon droit et raison de payer et acomplir ce qu'on a promis par paour, par force et contrainte; car celui qui se oblige en soy obligant et promectant doit estre en sa franchise, liberté et asseureté, sans paour, contrainte ne violence.

La promesse qui par paour
Est faicte, n'a point de valleur. /fol. 89a/

25. Stag and Sheep before Wolf Judge.

Ysopet I, 31, ll. 19-20: Car promesse qui par péur
Est faicte, n'a point de valeur.

26. De la Mousche et de l'Omme Chanu.

Une * mousche mordoit ung homme chanu sur la teste; il la cuida ferir, mes elle s'en alla, et ce frappa sur luy-mesmes. Depuis la mousche retourna et mordit comme devant, adonc il ne frappa plus et dist en jouant: " Cy en

cuidant ferir je me frappeie encore une foiz, tu n'en ferois que rire, et si je te frappe, je te turay, pour ce il vault mieulx que je me depporte et que tu t'en voisies, car, en me frappant dix foiz, je ne me bleseroie guiere, et en te frappant une seulle foiz, je te turoye."

Moralité.

Selon droit et raison, qui est frappé, il doit frapper et soy deffendre, mays c'est le plus seur et vault mieulx a celui qui est frappé, non frapper; car souvent celui qui se cuide venger d'un pou de desplaisir qu'on luy a fait, vient a grant inconvenient, et luy vaulsist mieulx qu'il s'en feust depporté a tant, et aussi tel cuide ferir qui tue.

Souvent pour petit de meffait

Reçoyvent mains pis que n'ont fait. /fol. 89b/

26. Bald Man and Fly.

* MS. The *e* of *Une* is over a half-obliterated *g*.

Ysopet I, 32, ll. 19-20: Souvent pour petit de meffait

Recovrent mains pis que n'ont fait.

27. Du Regnart et de la Cigoigne.

Le regnart donna a disner a la cigongne, et quant ilz furent a table, il respandit ung pot plain de miel et comença a lescher le miel de sa langue, et combien qu'il sceust bien que la cigongne n'en pouoit menger, cy luy prya pour faire maniere qu'elle mengast a bonne chere. Mes elle ne pouoit menger pour son bec, qui estoit trop long, si ce pensa qu'elle s'en vengeroit et luy rendroit la courtoisie. Elle semmoint aussi a disner et apporta une fiolle de varre plaine de miel, qui avoit la gueulle

longue et estroicte, la cigongne sçavoit bien que le regnart n'en pouoit menger, prya aussi le regnart qu'il mengast a bonne chere. La fain doubra au regnart voyant la bone viande par le voire cler, et n'en pouoit menger pour ce qu'il ne pouoit bouter sa teste dedans, et s'en partit a tout sa honte.

Moralité.

On ne doit point faire aucune chose qu'on ne voudroit qu'on luy feist, car si en faignant qu'on fist a aucun plaisir et on luy fait desplaisir, on dit qu'il seroit bien /fol. 90a/ employé, et que s'a esté bien fait. Et pour ce, celui qui ne tient foy, ne loyauté, ne serment qu'il promet ou jure, on n'est point tenu de lui garder, mais luy doit faire et rendre mal pour mal.

Qui fait ce qui a luy ne voudroit,
Se il s'en repent, c'est a bon droit.

27. Fox and Stork.

Ysopet I, 33, ll. 37-38: Qui fait que a soi ne voudroit
S'il s'en repent, c'est à bon droit.

28. Du Corbeau qui se para des Plumes du Paon.

Ung corbeau qui * print les plumes du paon et s'en vestit et para, et quant * il se regarda et s'en orgueillit tellement qu'il ne tint compte des autres oyseaulx ne n'avoit cure de leur compagnie, mes s'en alla avecques les paons, a qui il cuidoit ressembler. Lesquelx congneurent incontinant qu'il n'estoit pas paon, ains estoit contrefait; il leur despleut, si luy osterent les plumes de quoy il c'estoit paré, et les siennes aussi, et le batirent tres bien. Et quant il se vit ainsi nu et sans plumes, il fut tout

honteux, ne depuis n'osa converser avecques les autres oyseaulx. /fol. 90b/

Moralité.

Celluy qui lesse l'estat qui luy appartient et le veult avoir plus grant qu'il ne doit, et a ses parelz en desdain et se veult faire pareil et esgal a plus grant que luy, il luy en mesche, car ceulx a qui il se fait pareil *l'ont*† en desdaing et mettent peine a le destruire. Et quant il a adversité, ceulx de qui il ne tenoit compte n'ont cure de luy, et aussi il n'a cure de soy monstrier a eulx. Pour ce c'est le milleur et le plus seur de soy tenir en l'estat qu'on doit, et le peut-on prendre si grant qu'il en decheat après.

Qui plus hault monte qu'il ne doit,
Descend plus tost qu'il ne voudroit.

28. Crow in Peacock's Feathers.

* The sense of the first two lines will be clear if *qui* and *quant* are omitted.

† MS. *leur*.

Ysopet I, 34, ll. 29-30: Qui plus haut monte qu'il ne doit
De plus haut chiet qu'il ne voudroit.

29. Du'un Muletier et d'une Mulle.

Une mulle menoit une charrecte et son maistre estoit monté desus, qui la contraingnoit d'aller tost. Si luy vint une mousche qui volloit par devant ses yeulx et faisoit grant noise et luy disoit: "Pour quoy ne /fol. 91a/ vas-tu plus tost? Je te mordray se tu ne te avances d'aller." Et la mulle n'en tint compte, et luy dist: "Tu parles trop et faiz grant noise pour neant, ne ne tiens compte de toy ne de ton hault parler, car il n'y a point d'effect, et je

doubte et crains mon maistre, qui me maine par le frain ou il luy plect et me bat de son fouet et point des esperons.”

Moralité.

Quant ung homme de nulle valleur et qui n'a point de puissance voit ung grant et puissant en adversité, qui ne se ose ne peut deffendre, il parle a luy arrogamment et veult qu'il luy obeïsse et le contraint par menaces a faire ses voulentez, le saige n'en doit tenir compte ne doubter que seulement ceulx qui ont puissance et qui puent nuyre et en quel danger il est, car communement en grant parler ne fait l'en pas grant effect.

Le foible le fort menace,
Quant il voit le lieu et la place.

29. Mule and Fly.

Ysopet I, 35, ll. 23-24: Le feble le fort remenace

Quant il en voit ne lieu ne place.

30. De la Mousche et du Fromy. /fol. 91b/

La mousche cy avoit en desprisant le fromy et luy dist: “On ne te doit rien priser ne tenir compte de toy, car tu es presque tous jours enclos en une caverne en terre tout endormy de froidure, et je volle enemy l'air ou il me plect; tu ne mengues que du ble pourry et boiz de l'eaue d'une fosse toute puante, et je mengue bonne viande a la table des grans signeurs et dames et boy souvent de bon vin es hanaps; tu ne repaires qu'entre perres et racines, et moy entre les signeurs et dames, et les bayse souvent en la bouche.” Le fremy, a qui il desplaet des responcez de la mousche, luy rendit parolles poingnans et venimeuses:

“ Mousche, je suis en ma caverne *en* * reppos et en seureté, et quant tu volles en l'ayr, tu es tous jours en doubte que ung oyseau ne te pregne; je suis content de ce que j'ay, tu n'es de rien content; j'ay plus grant plaisir a menger se ble que j'ay amassé et gaingné que tu ne faiz en tes cheres viandes que tu hapes larsinenssment et a grant paour; je ne faiz a nully desplaisir, et tu le faiz a tous ceulx ou tu reppaires; tu as † desir de vivre pour menger, je /fol. 92a/ suis content de menger pour vivre; nul ne se met en peine de me mettre hors de ma caverne, et chascuns te chasse hors d'avecques luy et se garde de toy come de beste venimeuse, car souvent, quant tu veulx approucher de la viande, on te frappe d'un esmouchouer, par quoy il te convient mourir ou tu as une aelle rompue et ne volleras jamès; et il me souffist yver et esté de ma caverne, et quant yver approche, tu n'as plus de puissance, mes cheez morte de froit en divers lieux.”

Moralité.

On ne doit point despriser autrui en soy louant, car qui dit villennie et blasme d'autrui, il doit doubter que on n'en die autant de luy; et pour ce beau parler et gracieux requiert que on luy ayde, aussi celui de qui le lait parler vient, requiert qu'on die autant de luy.

La langue qui est venimeuse
Parolle n'aura gracieuse.

30. Fly and Ant.

* MS. *et*.

† MS. *n* before *as*.

Ysopet I, 36, ll. 69-70: La langue qui est venimeuse
Response n'aura gracieuse.

31. Du Regnart, du Lievre et du Cinge. /fol. 92b/

Le regnart fist adjourner le lievre par devant le cinge et l'actusa de larrecin. Le lievre nya qu'il eust rien de luy et le regnart ne le peut prouver. Quant le cinge qui estoit juge vit ce, considera la simplesse du lievre, qui procedoit de bonne foy, et que le regnart est nommé d'estre tricheur et barateur, il eust suspicion qu'il n'eust mauvaise cause, et pour ce il le condempna et delivra le *lievre*.^{*} Toutes foiz il leur fist faire paix ensemble.

Moralité.

Ung homme, qui est renommé de tricherie et barat ou autre mauvais vice, s'il a affaire devant le juge, on a tousjours suspicion sur luy qu'il ne veuille user de tricherie, et a peine le veult-on croire pour chose qu'il die, et pour ce il ce fait bon garder de telle renommee.

Qui de mentir a le regnon,
S'il dit vray, si ne le croit-on.

31. Fox, Hare, and Monkey Judge.

^{*} *ms. liure*.

Ysopet I, 37, has no corresponding couplet.

32. Du Preudomme et de la Mustelle. /fol. 93a/

Ung preudomme print une mustelle et elle luy prya qu'il ne la tuast point, mes qu'il estoit bien tenu de luy saulver la vie, car elle avoit mengé les souriz de sa maison, et pour son service ne luy demandoit autre chose fors qu'il luy saulvast la vie. Le preudome respondit: "Quant tu prenoys les souriz de ma maison, tu ne le faisoys pas pour mon prouffit, mes pour le tien, et pour ce je ne tiens pas

que tu me ays fait aucun plaisir, car on doit regarder la voulenté, non pas l'oeuvre, et se tu eusses eu regard a mon prouffit, tu eusses mengé les souriz, quant tu les prenoys, et gardé mon pain, de quoy tu es cy grasse; et pour ce je te turay et avray en resconpansacion de mon pain ta grasse peau."

Moralité.

Aucunes foiz tel fait prouffit a autrui qui ne le cuide pas faire et en veult avoir après remuneracion en faingnant qu'il a fait pour luy bien, mes quant on s'apperçoit qu'il ne l'a pas fait de sa voulenté, on n'est point /fol. 93b/ tenu de remunerer, car on doit plus considerer la bonne voulenté que le fait.

La voulenté le fait desoeuvre;
Le regarder, non pas l'euvre.

32. Man and Weasel.

Ysopet I, 38, ll. 29-30: La volentés le fait deceuvre.

La regardes, non pas a l'euvre.

33. De la Rayne et du Beuf.

La rayne se vout comparer a estre pareille au beuf et se enfla affin qu'elle feust plus grosse que le beuf. Son filz le sceut et luy dist: " Mere, ne vous enfler plus ainsi, car il vous pourroit nuyre, et aussi vous qui n'estes q'une petite beste contre le beuf, qui est grant et puissant." La rayne, a qui il en despleut, se enfla encore plus que devant, et son filz luy dist derechef: " Vous ne le puez vaincre, et s'il vous vaint, il n'y aura autre remede que luy criez mercy." La rayne par grant despit s'enfla si fort qu'elle creva par my le ventre.

Moralité.

Par ceste fable sont entenduz deux enseignemens. /fol. 94a/ L'un est que ung homme sans puissance et de petite espee, s'il consideroit la petisse de luy, jamès ne se prendroit ne vouldroit faire pareil au grant et puissant, et se d'aventure il le fait, il luy en mescherra. L'autre enseignement est que aucunes foiz, nonobstant q'un home soit jeune et de petit estat, il fait bon croire son conseil.

33. Frog and Ox.
Ysopet I, 39.

34. Du Lion et du Pastour.

En courant après une beste sauvage le lion se bouta une espine dedans le pié, qui luy fist grant mal et douleur, et n'en peust avoir garison jusques a ce qu'il vint a ung pastour, lequel, des qu'il le vit, cuida qu'il querist proye, si luy presenta l'un de ses pains affin qu'il s'en allast. Mes le lion le reffusa et s'assiet en luy monstrant son pié, et le pastour apperceut l'espine, si luy osta, et nectoya le pié, par quoy le lion fut gary et s'en alla. Depuis ce temps advint que /fol. 94b/ le lion fut prins des veneurs et mené a Romme, puis bouté avecques les autres lions. Et le pasteur aussi fut mené prisonnier a Rome, et par ses meffaiz condempné a mettre avec les lions, affin qu'ilz le mengassent. Mes si tost que le lion a qui il avoit osté l'espine le vit, il le congneut et courut a luy et faisoit feste de la queue et luy leschoit les mains et le garda des autres lions qu'ilz ne luy feissent mal; de quoy les Roumains s'esmerveillerent, et pour ce le delivrerent, et misdrent hors de prison et le lion et le pasteur.

Moralité.

Par ceste fable est monstré que ce au temps aucun t'a fait plaisir, si tu le voys en adversité et qu'il soit en ton danger et qu'il ait besoing de toy, combien qu'il ait long-temps qu'il te fist plaisir, et qu'il ne te congnoisse, cy es-tu tenu a luy aider et faire pour luy le mieulx que tu peulx. /fol. 95a/

En aucun temps ne doit servance
Ne bonté estre en oubliance.

34. Lion and Shepherd.

Ysopet I, 40, ll. 65-66: Par viellesce ne doit service
Ne bonté estre en oubli mise.

35. Du Lyon et du Cheval.

Le lion passoit par ung pre et avoit fain et eust voulentiers deceu le cheval et de fait le cuida decepvoir en luy disant: "Dieu te gard, beau frere, je suis tres bon chirurgien, cy tu as afaire de moy, je suis a ton commandement." Le cheval, que se apperceut de la trayson du lyon, luy dist: "Tu es tres bien venu a point, car une ronce m'a naguieres blecé, je te pryé que tu me garisses." Le cheval leva le pié derriere, le lion cuidoit qu'il dist vray et, en bessant la teste pour cuider happer, le cheval, qui s'en doubtoit, le frappa en la teste * cy fort qu'il demourra tout endormy et estaint d'un cop, et ainsi s'en alla le cheval. Et quant le lion fut revenu et qu'il peust parler, il dist: "Il est bien employé que j'aye /fol. 95b/ cecy, car je venoie a luy en faingnant que je feusse son amy, et il m'a fait le mal que luy cuidoye faire."

Moralité.

Quant aucun beau parleur te cuide decevoir et se vient offrir a toy sans ta requeste, ne te doys doubter, mes trouver maniere que en cuidant que tu le croyes[†] de ce qu'il te dit, que tu luy faces le mal qu'il te cuide faire, et puy luy doys lesser et ne tenir compte de luy.

Qui met peine a tricheur decepvoir,
Blasmé n'en doit estre, c'est le voir.

35. Lion and Horse.

* MS. *sit* erased after *teste*.

† MS. A c erased between *le* and *croyes*.

Ysopet I, 41, has no corresponding couplet, the three closest lines are ll. 55-57: Car cils ne fait pas tricherie

Qui a bareter s'estudie,
Pour le bareteur decevoir.

36. Du Beau Cheval et de l'Asne Pellé.

Ung beau cheval jeune et fort, a tout beau frain et beau harnoys, ne peult passer /fol. 96a/ par une rue estroicte cy tost qu'il vould sans arrester pour l'asne, qui estoit tant pesant, qui alloit devant tout le pas et ne se pouoit haster pour le grant faiz qu'il pourtoit. Cy en despleut au cheval et dist a l'asne moult orgueilleusement: " Meschante, chetive beste, pour quoy me empeschés-tu la voye et que tu ne me faces chemin pour passer a mon plaisir? A pou que je ne te tue ou affolle, car, des ce que tu me voys venir, qui-suis ton signeur, tu me deusses faire voye et me lesser passer." L'asne entand, escoute et endure. Depuis le cheval devint vieulx, megre et usé, pour ce luy fut osté son beau harnoys, et fut a une charrecte et souvent batu quant il n'alloit tost. L'asne le vit en ce point, cy en eust grant joye et com-

mança a rire, en luy disant: " Compains, ou est le bel harnoys doré que tu soulyoes porter et aller cy tost, et maintenant pour batre qu'on te face tu ne te peuz advencer, et pleures a present qui estoies si /fol. 96b/ orgueilleux et avoys en desdaing les povres et n'en tenoys compte? Or scez-tu maintenant que beaulté, honneur ne jeunesse ne durent pas longuement. La misere et malleureté en quoy tu es vengent de toy ceulx que tu souloies avoir en desdaing. Longuement puisses-tu vivre et demourer en cest estat, affin que tu apprenghes a avoir pitié de tes povres et petiz compagnons! "

Moralité.

Combien que tu soyes jeune, fort, bel et puissant, tu ne doiz pour ce avoir les povres en desdaing ne les blasmer ne despriser, mes en tant que tu as en toy plus de beaulx dons de nature, de tant doiz-tu estre plus humble envers tous, courtoys, gracieux et amyable; car quant ta jeunesse, ta beaulté, ta force, qui ne puent guiere durer, seront passez et d'aventure tu venoys a povvreté, /fol. 97a/ ceulx que tu avroys eu en desdaing te mespriseront aussi et ne tendront compte de toy, mes auront grant joye de ta povreté et misere, et sera plus grant ta doulleur qu'elle ne fut cy oncques ne eusses esté en grant estat et puissance.

36. Young Horse and Ass.
Ysopet I, 42.

37. Du Regnart et du Loup.

Le regnart, qui estoit povre et mouroit de fain, vit que le loup avoit assez viande, cy eust envie sur luy et pensa en luy-mesmes come il le pourroit faire mourir. Si vint a luy

en sa maison pour adviser et espier son estat, et print octasion d'y aller pour sçavoir come il luy alloit, mes pour ce qu'il aymoît tres bien, il avoit grant desir de le sçavoir. Le loup, qui se doubtoit de luy, luy dist en soy courossant: "Va-t'en hors de mon hostel et ne me dis plus telles parolles, car je sents bien que tu ne m'aymes point et que tu as envie de mon estat et ne viens cy que pour /fol. 97b/ moy trahir et decevoir." Le regnart,* qui avoit bien advisé les estres de l'ostel, s'en partit et s'en alla a ung pasteur et luy dist: "Ne me faiz nul mal et je te livray le loup, ton grant ennemy." Si mena le pastour en la maison du loup, qui cuidoit estre asseur et ne se doubtoit de rien. Quant le pasteur fut la, il le tua d'une massue. Depuis advint que le regnart fut prins a ung raiz et, ainsi qu'on le vouloit tuer, il dist: "J'ay bien desservy a mourir, car qui fait barat a autrui, il est deceu et baraté en la fin come moy, qui feis mourir le loup a tort et sans cause, et je meurs a bon droit et a bone cause et l'ay bien desservi."

Moralité.

Par ceste fable sont entenduz deux enseignemens. Le premier est que ung grant signeur riche et puissant, qui a plussieurs envieux, ne doit point lesser ne souffrir reparer ne converser entour luy gens mal /fol. 98a/ renommez et dont il a suspicion, et de tant qu'ilz s'efforcent plus de converser avecques luy, il les doit plus eslongner, car, en y reparent, ilz puent adviser tout son estat et veoir les voies et manieres par lesquelles ilz le feront destruire et mourir. L'autre enseignement est que on ne se doit point mesler ne entremectre de barat ne de tricherie, ne avoir envie du bien d'autrui, car, combien que on dure en ce faisant ung pou de temps, toutes foiz en la fin on est trompé de ce, et en deffinent leur vie malheureusement.

Ton ennemy avecques toy ne lesse estre,
Et barat a la fin triche son mestre.

37. Fox and Wolf.

* MS. *gen* erased after *regnart*.

Ysopet I, 43, has no corresponding couplet.

38. Du Cerf qui buvoit a la Fontaine.

Ainsi que ung cerf buvoit en une fontaine, il vit au fons de l'eau l'ombre de ses oreilles et cornes, qui luy semblerent moult /fol. 98b/ belles, et s'en orguillit et les aymoît et prisoit moult fort, plus que ne faisoit jamès ses jambes megres et seches. Cy advint que depuis en le chassant par ung boys et gué, l'ayde de,* ses megres jambes, de quoy il n'avoit tenu compte, luy servoient bien; il fuioit devant les chiens et courroit cy fort que cy les belles cornes, de quoy il avoit tenu si grant compte, ne l'eussent arresté, ne acroché aux branches d'un arbre, il feust eschappé.

Moralité.

C'est grant folie de trop amer et prendre plaisir a une chose seulement pour sa beaulté, et qui ne peut porter prouffit, † ainçois nuyst, et aussi de despriser une layde et desplaisant qui est bonne et prouffitable.

38. Stag and Antlers.

* For clearness omit *l'ayde de*.

† MS. *aincy* erased after *prouffit*.

Ysopet I, 44.

39. De la Bataille des Bestes et des Oyseaulx.

Jadiz les bestes et oyseaulx se combatirent /fol. 99a/ ensemble, et dura longuement la bataille, et chascun faisoit

cy bien devoir que on ne sçavoit dire qui avroit victoire. La chaulve-souriz eust paour que la partie des oyseaulx fust vaincue, si ce tourna devers les bestes, par quoy les oyseaulx furent esbaÿs et descouraigés et en peril de perdre la bataille, cy ne feust l'aigle, qui par son sens, force et hardement rallia les oyseaulx. Et fut la chaulve-souriz tellement batu et plumé qu'onques puis n'eust plumes, et n'ose voller que par nuyt.

Moralité.*

Quant par force, hardement, sens et vaillance une journée ou une bataille au grant besoing, et qui a esté en peril d'estre perdue, peut estre remise et gaingnee, on le doit tellement remercier et paier qu'il en soit content.

Les vaillans doit-on guerdonner,
Et les traistres deshonnorer.

39. Battle of Birds and Beasts.

* The moral of this fable has nothing in common with that of the corresponding fable in Walter of England; it seems to be incomplete.

Ysopet I, 45, has no corresponding couplet.

40. Du Rousignol et de l'Autour.

L'autour osta au rousignol ung de ses petiz /fol. 99b/ roussignouls; si luy prioit le roussignol qu'il le luy voulüst rendre, et l'autour, qui se mocquoit de luy, dist: " Pour ta priere je n'en feray ja riens, mes cy tu vouloys chanter, je feroys volentiers ce que tu voudras." Adonc le rousignol, nonobstant qu'il feust courrocé ou marry, mist peine a chanter et chanta le mieulx qu'il peust et le plus melodieusement, affin qu'il peust ravoit son oyseau. Mes quant il eust chanté longuement, et que l'autour fut en-

nuyé, il luy dist: " Je ne tiens compte de ton chant, car tu ne saz chanter." Si menga l'enffant du roussignol devant sa mere, laquelle eust tant de doulleur et souffrit de peine come faisoit son petit rousignol. Et depuis l'autour persevera tous jours en sa malice et cruaulté et fina sa vie honteusement et mauvairement, et en querant proye fut prins a la gluz et la mōurut.

Moralité.

Le mauvais homme cruel et sans pitié, qui s'acoustume desrober et piller povres gens /fol. 100a/ innocens qui oncques ne luy firent mal, combien qu'il dure et regne aucun peu de temps, toutes foyz a la fin il fine ses jours miserablement.

A peine a bon finement

Qui veult vivre mauvairement.

40. Nightingale and Hawk.

Ysopet I, 46, ll. 37-38: Jamès a nulz bon finement

Qui vivre veult mauvairement.

41. Du Loup et du Mouton.

Le loup qui fut malade et pour avoir garison voua a Dieu et aux sains que jamès de chair ne mengeroit. Les brebiz en eurent grant joye et cuidoient vivre des lors en avant en paix et seureté sans elles garder de leur ennemy. Si advint depuis que le loup fut gary, rencontra un gras mouton, et le loup luy dist: " Tu es saulmon et come saulmon je te mengeray, car je ne mengue point de chair."

Moralité.

Quant les traitres, tricheurs et larrons ont aucune adversité et apperçoyvent que s'ilz ne /fol. 100b/ sont ypo-

crites et papellars que on ne tendra jamès compte d'eulx, ilz devorent les simples gens de bonne foy et mectent a destruction.

Cil qui maine mauvaise vie,
S'il fait l'ypocrite, point ne t'y fie.

41. Wolf and Sheep.

Ysopet I, 47, has no corresponding couplet.

42. Du Serpent et de la Lyme.

Le serpent en la maison d'un serrurier trouva une lyme, qui luy dist: "Les dents qui me rongeront me puent mal faire, mes en me rongant je les rongeray et les destruiray, car le fer, qui est dur, je l'esmyne come pouldre, et ce que est bossu, je le faiz devenir uny et souple, et pour ce tu pers ta peine et me riz de ta follie, car tu te metz en peine de moy blecer, qui te puis nuyre et destruire."

Moralité.

C'est follie de voulloir prendre et blecer plus grant, plus * puissant de luy, car suppose /fol. 101a/ que foible se prent au fort, et il ne luy fait riens, ce n'est pas pour chose qu'il ne luy feist s'il pouoit, et qui continue le jeu en soy jouant, le foible est destruit sans que le fort mette guiere de peine.

Le plus foible doit obeir
Au plus fort et luy servir.

42. Serpent and File.

* *ms. plus after plus.*

Ysopet I, 48, ll. 27-28: Le plus foible doit obeir
Au plus fort et le conjoir.

43. De la Bataille des Loups contre les Brebiz.

Les loups se combatirent contre les brebiz, et fut le commencement de la bataille bien peneuse d'un costé et d'autre, mes a la fin, a l'ayde du berger, des moutons et des chiens, les brebiz eurent du millieur. Et quant les loups virent qu'ilz estoient les plus foibles, demanderent treves pour traicter la paix, et les brebiz l'actorderent; et firent paix ensemble, et affin que la chose feust plus seure, les loups baillirent leurs louveteaux, /fol. 101b/ et les brebiz, qui feurent nices, les chiens qui les devoient garder. Et quant les louveteaux devindrent grans, ensuyvant leur nature ilz imposèrent aux brebiz qu'elles avoient fait desplaisir a leurs predecesseurs, et fut la paix rompue et les brebiz sans chiens ne garde, si les prindrent et mengerent.

Moralité.

Quant on fait aucun traicté ou actord entre ses ennemys, on ne doit point eslongner de soy ne se desgarnir pour quelquechose que ce soit ceulx par qui on est gardé et de qui on a a besongner, car, cy tost que les ennemys le sçavront et qu'ilz verront leur avantaige sur toy et que tu n'as qui te puisse deffendre, ilz rompront treves, foy, serment et promesses, et te courront sus et te destruyront.

Explicit.

43. Battle between Wolves and Sheep.

Ysopet I, 49.

MS. After *Explicit* comes the seal of the Bibliothèque Royale and a line: "Ce livre appartient à Maistre Pierre Pantimer, Examinateur de par le Roy nostre Sire ou Chastellet de Paris."

MURRAY P. BRUSH.

XX.—HUDIBRAS IN GERMANY.

During the eighteenth century several attempts were made to translate the whole or parts of Butler's *Hudibras* into German. Josua Eiselein, who published a translation of *Hudibras* in 1845, gave in his introduction the only account of these translations yet written,¹ but his record is brief and inaccurate. Hence it may not be without value to re-examine Butler's work in its German forms, and, in addition, to investigate the position of *Hudibras* among those works which German admiration for English literature sought to introduce into Germany.

The earliest German references to Butler's poem are probably those in the notes and introduction which Christian Wernicke (1661-1725) added to his *Überschriften* in the edition of 1704, the last edition with which the author was personally concerned. Wernicke's mother was an Englishwoman, and Wernicke himself spent much time in England, where he had, it is probable, a considerable acquaintance with aristocratic circles at a time when the objects of Butler's satire were still fresh in memory. In his notes Wernicke quotes and translates two very brief passages from *Hudibras*, and in the introduction he paraphrases another. These references to *Hudibras* are merely incidental illustrations and do not in any way constitute an introduction of Butler to German readers. And, beyond this, Wernicke's book and even his name were almost completely forgotten by his contemporaries, and the worth

¹ Goedeke, *Grundriss*, VII, p. 713: "Übersetzungen des *Hudibras* mit Proben verzeichnet in Josua Eiseleins Verdeutschung des *Hudibras*."

of the *Überschriften* was not recognized till much later. Hence we may regard Wernicke's own acquaintance with *Hudibras* as a result of his peculiar privilege of birth and residence; and in any case these early allusions to Butler had practically no contemporary influence in directing attention to the poem.¹

¹ For Wernicke see Fulda, *DNL.*, 39, Erich Schmidt, *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, W. G. Howard, *Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass.* for September, 1908, and Rudolf Pechel, *Chr. Wernickes Epigramme*, in *Palaestra*, 71, Berlin, 1909. Bodmer called attention to Wernicke's importance and published editions of the *Überschriften* in 1749 and 1763. The following are Wernicke's references to *Hudibras* (edition of 1763): p. 79, Wernicke quotes two lines from *Hudibras* (l. 679-70) containing a commendation of brevity; p. 224, he quotes four lines beginning, "Th' extreams of Glory and of Shame" (Pt. 2, l. 271-4). The first is introduced by: "und Hudibras uns nicht weit verführet, wenn er saget," and the second by "Es sind nicht meine, sondern des berühmten Buttlers Worte, wie sie in seinem sinnreichen englischen Knittelgedichte, *Hudibras* genannt, folgender massen zu finden sind." In the introduction Wernicke remarks: "Die meisten derselben (Frauenzimmer) bilden sich wie des Hudibras Wittwe ein: Es sei der Poet nicht in den falschen Achat ihrer Augen, sondern in die wahre Diamanten ihrer Ohren; nicht in die Perlen ihres Mundes, sondern in die Perlenschnur ihres Halses; nicht in das Gold ihrer Haare, sondern in die Dukaten, die in ihrem Kasten liegen, verliebt;" which is a free paraphrase of a passage in the "Lady's Answer to the Knight." Wernicke may possibly have had *Hudibras* in mind when on p. 63 he said that German was nothing but a "babylonische Thurmsprache," cf. *Hudibras*, I, 93, or when on page 112 he referred to the opinion that the angel spoke German in expelling Adam and Eve from Paradise, cf. *Hudibras*, I, 179-80. Wernicke uses "Knittelverse" with considerable frequency in his *Überschriften*; he suggests the word "Knittelgedicht" for "what the French call Poème Burlesque (p. 61); and defends the rhymes "Staat an" and "Satan," "Dichterling" and "Palatin," as "der Kunst gemäss" and "ein unterscheidendes Zeichen der Knittelgedichte" (pp. 237-8). He adds concerning such rhymes: "So gar, dass, wer dergleichen Verse aus Kurzweil schreibt, nicht allein dieselben nicht vermeiden, sondern mit allem Fleiss aufsuchen muss."

The first effort to introduce *Hudibras* into Germany was made by Bodmer, whose translation of the first two cantos appeared in 1737. Bodmer probably first read of *Hudibras* in Addison's essay on "Laughter and Ridicule" in the *Spectator*, No. 249, and Th. Vetter, who in the recent memorial volume on Bodmer¹ has written briefly of Bodmer's interest in *Hudibras*, suggests that Bodmer's curiosity may have been further aroused by a note in commendation of Butler's work in the French translation of the *Spectator*, which indeed Bodmer knew before he read the original. Though Bodmer was later responsible for a renewed interest in Wernicke's *Überschriften*, there is no proof that he knew anything about Wernicke before 1724, when Ulrich König in a letter to Bodmer gave some account of Wernicke's work and some facts of his life, but "all in a way which shows plainly that he was dealing with a completely unknown author."² Bodmer knew the *Spectator* in the French translation as early as 1718.

Vetter thinks that Bodmer probably borrowed *Hudibras* from Dr. Zellweger in Trogen, but at precisely what time he is unable to say. In writing to his friend, May 30, 1723, Bodmer remarked: "Ich verlange Tolands und Rochesters. Endlich vermeine ich, dass Milton's *Paradis*

When in the service of Graf Büнау (1748-1754), Winckelmann read widely in English literature and made an anthology of English poets the manuscript of which, in his hand, is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. There are particularly extensive extracts from *Hudibras*. See Karl Justi, *Winckelmann in Deutschland* (*Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen*, Vol. I.) Leipzig, 1898, pp. 221-224. For this reference I am indebted to Mr. W. G. Howard, of Harvard University, who also kindly called my attention to Wernicke.

¹ Joh. Jac. Bodmer, *Denkschrift z. CC. Geburtstag*, Zürich, 1900. See also Vetter's monograph, *Zürich als Vermittlerin englischer Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, Zürich, 1891.

² See Fulda, *DNL.*, 39, p. 521.

lost oder Buttler's *Hudibras* mein Ergötzen seyn würde."¹ The loan took place quite probably at this time. In a letter from Bodmer to Johann Michael von Loen,² dated January 12, 1729, there is a quotation from *Hudibras*, a proof of continued interest during the years between this earlier acquaintance and the translation in 1737.

The title of Bodmer's translation is *Versuch einer deutschen Übersetzung von Samuel Butler's Hudibras, einem satirischen Gedichte wider die Schwärmer und Independanten zur Zeit Carls des Ersten*. Franckfurt und Leipzig, 1737. The book is small octavo and contains seventy-nine pages of text preceded by an introduction of fourteen pages. Bodmer's translation is in prose and, as noted above, comprises only the first two cantos. The preface, as the first introduction of *Hudibras* to the German public, is significant. After commenting on the need of a prefatory word of explanation, Bodmer gives a short account of Butler's life. He then turns to the poem itself. In direct though unacknowledged dependence on Addison, Bodmer divides burlesque poetry into two kinds—that which presents an insignificant character in the guise of a hero, and that in which a heroic character is degraded. Bodmer, representing the Swiss opposition to rhyme, naturally minimizes the importance of the external form of the poem. In treating of Hudibrastic verse, Bodmer, either through his insufficient knowledge of English or as a result of his prejudice against rhyme, attributes to Addison an opinion which is not a reasonable inference from Addison's own words. Bodmer says of Addison: "Er fürchte, eine grosse Anzahl von denen, welche den

¹ Quoted by Vetter.

² Vetter refers for this letter to *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, 1856, p. 34.

unvergleichlichen Hudibras bewundern, thun solches vielmehr in Ansehn dieser Doppel-Reimen, als derjenigen Stellen, welche in der That wunderwürdig sind." What Addison really did say was: "If Hudibras had been set out with as much wit and humor in heroic verse as he is in doggerel, he would have made a much more agreeable figure than he does; though the generality of his readers are so wonderfully pleased with the double rhymes that I do not expect many will be of my opinion in this particular,"—which is something quite different. Bodmer says in this connection, strangely enough, that English verse allows no feminine or double rhymes except in comic poetry. This same question of the relation of the form to the worth of the poem is discussed also a little further on, when Bodmer seeks to account for the absence of previous attempts at translation. This is ascribed in part to the impossibility of rendering Butler's rhymes in German and the opinion that half of his spirit would be lost without them. "But," says Bodmer, "such an objection could only be made by those of depraved taste, who find merriment and wit in the mere similarity of letters and sounds." Bodmer notes that Butler's style is very prosaic and hence would lose very little in a prose translation. Such a translation, he says, "welche treu und ausdrucksam ist, wird uns durch Abschneidung der Cadentz, des Sylbenmasses, und des Schalls der Reimen, nur das Geräusche aus dem Wege räumen, welches uns hindert, Butler's Art sich die Dinge vorzustellen, ohne Zerstreuung einzusehen."

The notes on Butler's life, the general statement of his purpose in writing *Hudibras* and the brief account of historical conditions, are all derived directly from the anonymous introduction to *Hudibras*, first printed in the edition of 1704. Copying almost verbally from his

source, Bodmer says that Butler had in the employ of Sir Samuel Luke "die beste Gelegenheit, diese lebendigen Charactere von Gleissnerey, Aberwitz, Wahnsinnigkeit, und Meineid kennen zu lernen," and that the main purpose of the poem was, "die Feuerbläser in der Kirche und dem Staat durchzuhecheln, welche unter dem Vorwand der Religion den König Carl ermordet, ein eigenmächtiges Regiment eingeführet, und Gleissnerey, Heuchelei, und Schwärmerey auf den Thron gesetzt." The English editor referred for historical information to Foulis's *History of Presbyterianism*¹ and Walker's *History of Independency* and particularly to Clarendon; Bodmer makes similar reference but omits the names of the first two authors. The inference is that Bodmer had no opinions of his own relative to the great rebellion in England and copied the anti-Roundhead introduction of the English editor, perhaps not realizing how its sweeping denunciation would involve his own literary idol, Milton. Bodmer expressed in this introduction the hope that his fragment might induce some other translator to render the whole into German. A reason why he himself did not continue the work is to be found in a letter written to Zellweger, July 22, 1747, ten years after the publication of the two cantos. In it Bodmer says: "Ihr könnt jedermann sagen, dass ich den *Hudibras* nicht fortsetzen werde: die Deutschen sind noch überhaupt zu unempfindlich für seine feinen Stiche. Wenn sie erst eine Empfindung davon bekommen, so haben sie den *Stilum familiare* besser im Besitz als die Schweizer und können diese Arbeit geschickter ausführen."² Bodmer supplied

¹ *The History of the Wicked Plots and Conspiracies of our pretended Saints, the Presbyterians.* London, 1662, Oxford, 1674.

² Baechtold, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in der Schweiz*, notes, p. 175.

but four notes to his two cantos; of these, three are taken from English editions, two appearing in that of 1674, and repeated in later editions, and the third added in the edition of 1710. The fourth note is original and explains that the word "Kirchenreformation," used in the description of Heinz (Ralpho), refers to the "falsche Reformation der fanatischen Independenten." Bodmer was evidently alarmed lest his German readers might here understand the Lutheran Reformation.

Gottsched reviewed Bodmer's attempt in his *Beiträge zur kritischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*.¹ Most of this article is a repetition of information afforded in Bodmer's work. The critic differs from Bodmer only in reference to the question of the use of prose or verse in the translation. It is noted that the *Froschmäuseler* was written in "Knittelverse," and the opinion is expressed that *Hudibras* would sound doubly droll in such a translation. Gottsched hopes that Bodmer will continue the translation and that some one will turn the prose into verses, "und zwar in solche, die hübsch altfränkisch klingen." Gottsched quotes two passages from Bodmer's work, the first fourteen lines and the address to the Muse (lines 645-664). As an exemplification of his opinions relative to the superiority of a translation in verse, he turns the first passage into "Knittelverse." To what extent Gottsched was acquainted with the original poem it is not possible to determine from this review. In the first words of the review, acquaintance is implied; here he states that the beauty of the original, a masterpiece of its kind, and the strength of the translation induced him to give a detailed account. Though it be

¹ Herausgegeben von einigen Mitgliedern der deutschen Gesellschaft in Leipzig. 17tes Stück. Leipzig, 1737, pp. 167-176.

recognized that he intended only to versify Bodmer's prose, it is noteworthy that there is in his lines no hint of the original. He makes twenty-five lines of what in Butler is only fourteen. His use of Bodmer may be illustrated by a few quotations.

- | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|
| (1) | Original | "When civil dudgeon first grew high"— |
| | Bodmer | "Die Hitze war jetzt bey Bürgern und Bauern
aufs höchste gestiegen." |
| | Gottsched | "Itzt war die Hitz in Städt'n und Maur'n
So hoch gestiegen, als bey'n Bauer'n." |
| (2) | Original | "When hard words, jealousies and fears
Set folks together by the ears." |
| | Bodmer | "Bittre Worte, Neid und Furcht banden Städten
und Gemeinden die Haare zusammen und
brachten sie in den Harnisch." |
| | Gottsched | "Furcht, Hass und Neid mit bittern Worten
Banden schon dem Volk an allen Orten
Die Haar zusamm, macht' alles frisch
Bracht' jedermann in den Harnisch." |
| (3) | Original | "Then did Sir Knight abandon dwelling
And out he rode a-colonelling." |
| | Bodmer | "Als der Herr Ritter seine Wohnung verliess
und auf einen Strauss ausritt." |
| | Gottsched | "Als unser Rittersmann sein Haus
Verliess und ausritt auf einen Strauss." |

Gottsched refers to Hudibras's squire as Heinz, the name which Bodmer gives him.

In 1764, J. J. Dusch published his *Briefe zur Bildung des Geschmacks an einen jungen Herrn von Stande*, a kind of compendium of literary culture. In his chapter on the comic epic he translated quite freely from *Hudibras*, giving in all about twelve hundred lines in prose. He admitted that the poem lost much in this form, but thought it too difficult to invent a metre corresponding to the original. A later edition of Dusch's work (1770) contained a few trivial changes.

The first complete translation of *Hudibras* was published in 1765. It was in prose and was the work of Johann Heinrich Waser.¹ Waser was from 1746 to his death in 1777 Diaconus at Winterthur, was a member of the Zürich literary circle, and an intimate friend of Bodmer's. He is best known as a translator of Swift and Lucian. It is probable that his interest in English literature came from his acquaintance with Bodmer, and possibly the impulse to translate *Hudibras* may be attributed to the same source. Whether or not Waser was first directed to *Hudibras* by Bodmer, there was certainly much in Waser's temperament and tastes akin to the spirit of the poem. The authors whom he chose to translate are a testimony to his love of wit, satire, and burlesque. He is said to have had a rare talent for aping other people's peculiarities; "er war wie zum kaustischen Spott geboren," it was said of him,² though Bodmer thought that such an idea did him injustice, that he was "böse nur auf den Irrthum und die Bosheit," and calls him

¹ *Samuel Butler's Hudibras, ein satyrisches Gedicht wider die Schwärmer und Independenten zur Zeit Carls des Ersten, in neun Gesängen, aus dem Englischen übersetzt, mit historischen Anmerkungen und Kupfern versehen*, Hamburg und Leipzig, 1765. The book was really published in Zürich. Waser's name is given by Goedeke as Heinrich only. Brief accounts of Waser's translation are found in Vetter's two monographs: *Zürich als Vermittlerin*, see above, and *Johann Heinrich Waser, Diakon zu Winterthur, ein Vermittler englischer Literatur, Neujahrsblatt herausgegeben von der Stadtbibliothek in Zürich auf das Jahr 1898*, pp. 31. See also Hirzel's article on Waser in the *Vierteljahrschrift für Litteraturgeschichte*, V, pp. 301-312 (1892).

² Raumer, *Historisches Taschenbuch*, x, p. 415, or Hirzel, *Wieland und Martin und Regula Künzli*, Leipzig, 1891, p. 11. Hirzel attributes this characterization to Wieland and refers to Raumer, but Raumer does not ascribe it directly to Wieland.

“den lehrenden Lacher, den sanften, nicht den boshaften Satir.”¹

Waser's translation met with opposition from the Zürich censors, an opposition which Waser had feared for his Swift. Bodmer says in his tribute to Waser, published in the *Deutsches Museum* some years after Waser's death: “Seiner Person wehe zu thun, wandte ein mächtiger Priester sein ganzes Ansehn an, die Übersetzung zu unterdrücken. . . . Eine Schuzschrift, die Waser schrieb, machte das Übel noch ärger.” This powerful clergyman was Johann Konrad Wirz. The efforts of Bodmer and Breitinger were fruitless, and the permission of the censor could not be obtained; so the publishers dodged the issue and printed on the title page, “Hamburg und Leipzig” instead of Zürich. The defence which Bodmer mentions is shown by Hirzel² to have been probably only a letter written by Waser to his publishers: this contained an elaborate vindication of his position, and Waser gave the publishers permission to make what use of it they chose.

The introduction to Waser's translation, which covers nineteen pages, is ostensibly by another hand; but Hirzel, though without giving his reasons, asserts that Waser doubtless wrote it himself. In it the Latin inscription on Butler's tomb is given, but one is referred to Chauffepié's *Dictionary* for further information concerning Butler's life. The rest of the introduction treats chiefly of the historical background. The information is derived

¹ *Denkmaal dem Übersetzer Buttlers, Swifts und Luzians errichtet von Joh. Jak. Bodmer, Deutsches Museum, 1784, 1, pp. 511-527.*

² *Vierteljahrschrift für Litteraturgeschichte*, see above. Hirzel gives the letter in full. Vetter's two monographs mentioned above give similar information relative to this controversy.

from Hume, and the cause of the Independents is severely condemned. Waser made use of three different editions of Butler's original. From a note on page 8 we know that he followed principally the edition of 1689. He quotes the lines about wooing a widow which were published only in the editions of 1704, 1710, and 1726. The elaborately annotated edition of *Hudibras* published by Zachary Grey in 1744 was also in Waser's possession; for he copied a large proportion of his numerous notes, five-sixths or even more, directly or in condensed form from Grey's commentary. Waser's additional notes are thus comparatively few and unimportant. Waser made no acknowledgment of his large indebtedness, but near the end of the first canto in connection with the lines:

"So have I seen, with armèd heel
A wight bestride a Common-weal" (925-6),

he says that Grey, "von dem man eine Ausgabe unsers Verfassers hat" had explained this as a reference to Richard Cromwell; he then goes on to note the different explanation which is given in the French translation by Townley.¹ There are other references to Townley's work.² Waser's translation contained nine illustrations.³

The *Göttingsche Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen*⁴ reviewed Waser's translation very briefly; the reviewer (Haller) thinks the meaning of this difficult poet well retained; but complains that the droll swing of the rhymes is lost in the translation. He is also of the opinion that the use of the Latin in the German rendering is less.

¹ John Townley's translation was published anonymously in 1757.

² Pp. 379-80, and 493.

³ According to the review in the *Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* these illustrations were by Gessner.

⁴ 1766, I, p. 32.

effective than in the original. The *Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften*¹ gave Waser's book a long review. The notes and introduction are declared excellent, and, though the translation of individual lines is criticised and examples of inaccuracies are given, it is stated that these minor defects detract very little from the worth of the translation as a whole. One passage is given in the original and in Waser's text as a specimen of Waser's success (I, 419-436). The reviewer incidentally implies that few have read *Hudibras*, and does not think this, in view of the difficulties of the poem, is a matter for surprise. The *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* in a very short notice of Waser's translation calls it "überhaupt nicht misgerathen."² Herder thought highly of Waser's *Hudibras*.³

Schubart said in his *Vorlesungen über die schönen Wissenschaften*⁴ that Riedel had promised a translation of *Hudibras*, but had never produced it. This promise may have been made, but we are not justified in inferring such a promise from Riedel's own recorded statement. In one of his *Briefe über das Publikum*, one addressed to Klotz, he says: "Sie wissen, wie lange ich schon an einer deutschen Versart gekünstelt habe, durch welche man denjenigen Ton ausdrücken könnte, den ich nicht

¹ II, 1, pp. 273-82. (1766).

² 1766, 2, p. 261.

³ *Sämmtliche Werke* (Suphan) IV, 189. Herder's interest in *Hudibras* is attested by several quotations in his early works, the *Fragmente* and the *Kritische Wälder*; cf. *Sämmtliche Werke* (Suphan), I, 216, 269, 314, 319; II, 221, 301, 392.

⁴ Augsburg, 1777. Schubart says that the "Knittelverse" of Hans Sachs would be the suitable measure for a translation. Flohr thinks Schubart here influenced by Gottsched's opinion: *Geschichte des Knittelverses vom 17ten Jahrhundert bis zur Jugend Goethes*, in *Berliner Beiträge zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie*. Berlin, 1893, pp. 93 ff.

anders als den Hudibrastischen zu nennen weiss; aber das wissen Sie, dass es mir nicht gelungen ist; die Strophen, welche ich vor einiger Zeit Ihnen zuschickte, sind zu nichts nütze und ich bitte Sie das Ding ganz zu unterdrücken. Vielleicht wären nur die drei Zeilen erträglich,—

“Indess posaunt der Pfaff ins Land
Und schlägt die Trommel mit der Hand
Auf seinem Canzelpult.”

Auch hier ist der Sinn des Originals nicht vollkommen übertragen und der Ton der Kriegslieder ist nicht der, in welchem die Buttlerische Muse deutsch singen muss. Vielleicht wären zu dieser Absicht unsere Knittelverse am meisten geschickt, allein der Deutsche ist zu delicat, und wer würde unter uns ein Werk lesen wollen, welches aus zwölf tausend Knittelversen zusammengesetzt wäre.”¹ This does not necessarily imply that Riedel intended to translate the whole of Butler’s masterpiece, and it is quite possible that he, from the standpoint of criticism and æsthetic theory, was simply endeavoring to approximate a measure which might suggest the flavor of the original.

Riedel’s attempt at translation is found entire in Chr. Heinrich Schmid’s *Zusätze zur Theorie der Poesie und Nachrichten von den besten Dichtern*.² Schmid introduces it with the wish, “Könnte ich doch Herrn Riedel bewegen in der Übersetzung des *Hudibras* so fortzufahren als folgende Probe ist.” The translation is not in “Knittelverse” but in a six-line stanza; the first of these stanzas is as follows:—

¹ *Briefe über das Publikum*, Jena, 1768, pp. 117-8.

² *Dritte Sammlung*, Leipzig, 1769, p. 291.

"Hoch sprudelte des Bürgers Wuth
 Man zog ins Feld und heischte Blut
 Und wuste nicht, Warum?
 Man stritt für Frau Religion
 Wie für die Hur ein Bacchus-sohn
 Und wuste nicht, Warum?"

Riedel makes six such stanzas from the first twenty-eight lines of the poem. He alludes to *Hudibras* frequently in illustration of his ideas in the *Theorie der schönen Künste und Wissenschaften*.¹ Riedel's doubts, quoted above, as to the German reader's acceptance of the real *Hudibras* brought forth the following protest from Wieland: "Bekümmern Sie sich nichts darum, ob Ihre höflichen Landsleute den hudibrasischen (!) Ton leiden können oder nicht Sie sollen ihn leiden! Es gibt unter den Lesern mehr feine Köpfe, als mancher deutscher Autor, der nicht Gelegenheit gehabt, *de se faufler parmi des gens du grand monde*, sich einbildet."² It is worthy of note that Wieland had here in mind a select group of readers and not the reading public in general.

In the June number of Wieland's *Teutscher Merkur*³ for 1778, there is an anonymous fragment entitled *Probe einer neuen Verdeutschung des Hudibras*. Wieland said in the March number for 1779⁴ that this translation had been sent from Königsberg. It is preceded by an introduction which is mainly concerned with the metrical form of the poem. The author herein expresses the opinion that the worth of the poem is so dependent on

¹ *Sämmtliche Werke*, Wien, 1785-7, III.

² Letter to Riedel on August 10, 1768, *Auswahl denkwürdiger Briefe von C. M. Wieland*, herausgegeben von L. Wieland, Wien, 1815, p. 202.

³ Pp. 227-248.

⁴ Pp. 284-5.

the nature of the verse that one must miss even in the best prose translation half of the original's peculiar beauty. This he acknowledges in spite of his indebtedness to Waser for many a fitting expression and many explanations of obscurities. The fact that English and German are cognate languages, he says, should make a faithful translation in German more easily possible than in any other tongue. But when one goes beyond the rendering of English expressions into corresponding German, difficulties are encountered. It is rarely possible to translate English iambic lines by the same number of German lines in the same measure; for English is largely monosyllabic and the polysyllables have for the most part no "chance lengthenings." Two ways are open to the translator; to increase the number of lines, preserving the metre, or to introduce other feet and keep the number of lines. The latter plan is adopted in the present case, though sometimes the increase in the number of lines is not to be avoided.

In this number of the *Merkur* there was published about one-third of the first canto (284 lines); and in the December number of the same year¹ the remainder of the first canto is given, with omission of a part of the description of Ralpho (lines 529-622). The translation is followed by a *Beilage für die Leser des Hudibras*.² This contains a short characterization of Butler and the objects of his satire, but is chiefly devoted to a translation of extracts from Butler's *Remains* as published by Thyer, the characters of "Anabaptist" and "An Hermetic Philosopher"; the latter is somewhat abridged. Some information is given concerning "characters" as

¹ Pp. 201-222.

² Pp. 222-240.

a form of literary composition. Both the translation and the supplement are signed "K." The metre of the translation is quite irregular. There are occasional five-foot couplets, also single five-foot lines, and several quatrains rhyming *a b b a*, or *a b a b*; and two triplets. The rhymes are imperfect, the most frequent violence being the rhyming of words ending in *e* and *en*; an occasional attempt at eccentric double rhymes in Hudibrastic style is found, such as, Republik *ab*: Unglück *ab*, Wohnhaus: Person *aus*. The translation is accompanied by a few notes relating mostly to the rendering of individual passages. In one of these notes the translator expressed the opinion that Wernicke's talents would have well fitted him to turn *Hudibras* into German. At the close of the introduction he said that he should be heartily glad if another, prompted by this attempt, should by his own translation put this one to shame. It is probable, however, from the context, that the translator had in his mind at that time a complete version. The *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*¹ attributes to Wieland the introduction to this *Merkur* fragment; it is, however, by the author of the translation itself.

In the March number of the *Merkur* for 1779² Wieland announced that a friend in St. Petersburg had sent him, a few months before, a new translation of the first canto of *Hudibras*; he remarked that this was perhaps not so literally faithful as the attempt of the previous year, but it seemed to him to read more pleasantly because the writer had given his "Knittelverse" a less heavy movement and more roundness. Since the comparison of these two translations with one another and with the

¹ *Anhang*, 53-86. III, pp. 1789-1794.

² Pp. 248-9.

original might afford some readers pleasure, Wieland promised to publish a sample of this version; and in the April number this promise is fulfilled.¹ This fragment was signed "S," and was the first attempt of Dietrich Wilhelm Soltau to render *Hudibras* in German verse. It contained less than a third of the first canto (274 lines), but it appeared in the index as *Hudibras, erster Gesang*, and has been recorded in Goedeke and elsewhere as a translation of the first canto.

At Riga in 1787 the publisher Hartknoch issued Soltau's complete translation.² In the introductory note of two pages Soltau indicated the purposes of Butler's satire, and remarked that the poem would afford little entertainment to one who was not in some measure acquainted with English history. As a consequence, he considered it a thankless task to supply extensive historical and critical comment. The few notes which he has given are mostly taken from Grey. The part of the first canto which had previously appeared in the *Merkur* is very much changed. A very small proportion of the lines remains absolutely unaltered, but it is worthy of note that comparatively few of the changes affect the rhyme words. The verse is smoother, and there are fewer irregularities and deviations from the regular couplet measure. For example, in the whole of the first canto there are but two triplets and one quatrain a b b a, whereas in the 274 lines of the fragment there were three quatrains a b a b and five a b b a, one of these latter being extended into a b b a c c a. There is little endeavor to make eccentric rhymes, and most of the rhymes are masculine. Soltau has omitted many lines.

¹ Pp. 72-82.

² 8vo., pp. 444. *Hudibras frey verdeutscht, dem Herrn Hofrath Wieland zugeeignet von D. W. S.*

In 1797 Soltau brought out at Königsberg a revised edition of his translation.¹ In the brief introduction he says that he has often been asked why he translated *Hudibras* at all, and he gives the following reasons: the position of the poem in English literature, its fund of wit and humor, and the possibility of applying Butler's satire to the "hosenlose Philosophie" at the end of the eighteenth century. He also mentions the advantages possessed by a German translator in the relationship of German to English, and recognizes the necessity of understanding the history of the time in order to appreciate *Hudibras*. Soltau speaks in this edition of the translation of 1787 as "äusserst mangelhaft," and says that it displeased him as soon as it had left the press. Incidentally he calls Waser's translation a "wretched one." Soltau has again smoothed out the irregularities of the verse, and has altered in many cases individual words and expressions in the interest of conciseness, accuracy, and vigor. Less often he has retranslated a passage. Perhaps rather more than half the lines remain entirely unchanged, or altered only by a single word or in the order of words. There are fairly frequent changes affecting the rhymes, perhaps in a fifth of the couplets.

Since Soltau dedicated the completed translation of 1787 to Wieland, the latter gave only a brief notice of it in the *Merkur*, remarking, however, that he found no reason for withdrawing his former approval.² The *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*³ reviewed Soltau's translation on

¹ Königsberg, bey Nicolovius, pp. 474. A later edition was issued at Reutlingen by Mäcken u. Comp. 1800, I, pp. 280; II, pp. 228.

² *Merkur*, 1787, *Anzeiger* for August, p. cxii.

³ Jena, IV, p. 84, October 9, 1790.

the whole with favor. The critic acknowledges the importance of the metrical form in the original, and agrees that the poem could be most fittingly rendered in German in "Knittelverse." The reviewer is, however, of the opinion that the tone of the translation does not really reproduce that of the original, is rather a substitute for the characteristically Hudibrastic. A specimen of the translation is given, and one error is pointed out, with the hint that more care for accuracy would not have been superfluous. The same journal reviewed Soltau's revised edition with much more out-spoken praise,¹ saying that it might be counted among "den vollendetsten Kunstwerken des poetischen Übersetzer-talents." Soltau is credited with genius for the comic, with taste and unwearying industry. The passages in the former edition which merited criticism have, we are told, been perfected. Soltau's use of false rhymes and of obsolete forms is commended, as well as his ingenious creation of new words. With considerable warmth the reviewer condemns those who hold that the poem is solely personal satire, the effect of which is now lost; he admits that some knowledge of the historical background is essential to a complete understanding of the poem, but asserts that this is no reason for ruining one's enjoyment of its wit and humor. Many passages, he insists, are written for all time; and he gives examples of such passages. The reviewer of Soltau's translation in the *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*² gives a short account of the previous attempts

¹ July 26, 1800. This review is the foundation of the account of Soltau's translation in Ebeling's *Geschichte der komischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1869. Much of this review is copied there word for word. Ebeling mentions the review in a foot-note, but makes no real acknowledgment of his indebtedness. III, 105-8.

² *Anhang*, 53-86, III, pp. 1789-94.

to translate *Hudibras*, and notes a passage of thirty-eight lines, first in the original, and then in Waser's and in Soltau's translations. The difficulties involved in making a translation of *Hudibras*, especially in view of the peculiar and characteristic verse of the original, are emphasized here as by no other reviewer. In his opinion, German literature is to be congratulated on this new acquisition, a faithful and readable translation of so valued a poem.

Soltau's translation was also reviewed by the *Göttingsche Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen*, in the issue for January 5, 1788. The critic there quotes Dr. Johnson's opinion of the obstacles to one's enjoyment in reading *Hudibras*. He then queries: "If this is the experience of an Englishman, how must it be with a German, since the book gains its chief value from the faithful delineation of foreign party spirit? And above all with a German who needs a translation?" According to this reviewer, so much must be lost in any translation that one cannot help regretting the labor of the translator, even more when one sees how he has studied and loved the original, and in many ways has achieved a successful version. The reviewer is evidently of the opinion that it is really not worth while to try to translate *Hudibras* into German.¹

After the publication of Soltau's first edition in 1787, there appeared in the *Deutsches Museum*, for September, 1788, a translation of the first canto in verse by Dietrich Wilhelm Andreä.² This is the smoothest of the metrical translations. The rendering it freer than Sol-

¹ There is a review of Soltau's translation in the *Tübing. gel. Anz.*, 1798, pp. 802-7, which I have been unable to examine.

² *Deutsches Museum*, 1788, II, pp. 216-248. See Meusel, *Das gelehrte Deutschland*, I, pp. 72-3.

tau's and the number of lines in the original (918) has been increased by over one hundred.

Another complete translation of *Hudibras* was published at Vienna in 1811. It bore the misleading title: *Samuel Butler's Hudibras, ein satyrisches Gedicht in neun Gesängen, neu verdeutscht mit historischen Anmerkungen, von Carl Anton von Gruber*. The translation is of slight interest, as it is merely a revision of Waser's book. The introduction is brief; in it Gruber states that the publishers desired to give the well-known Waser translation a purer German text, and to make the difficult passages more easily understood. The changes were made, it was said, from political, moral and æsthetic considerations. The alterations are trivial. The short historical note in the preface is derived from Waser's introduction, and the notes are reproduced from Waser, abridged to a third or a fourth of their original bulk.

In 1845 Josua Eiselein, "Professor und weiland Oberbibliothekar der Universität Heidelberg," published at Freiburg im Breisgau his metrical version of *Hudibras*. The preface is dated at Constance, in September, 1845. The long introduction is a curious patchwork of erudition, constant digression, irrelevant quotation, and pure pedantry. One or two examples from the beginning will show Eiselein's method. After giving the meagre facts concerning Butler's birth and parentage, Eiselein continues: "He was a boy of four years when the greatest writers of Britain and Spain, Shakespeare and Cervantes, died on the same day, April 23, 1616; on this account one is accustomed to apply to them the line from Cornelius Severus,

'Abstulit una dies aevi decus utrumque.'

In the next paragraph, however, the author notes that England accepted the Gregorian calendar in 1752, and hence Shakespeare's death was really ten days earlier. Eiselein cites several instances of coincidence in days of birth and death, and discusses the question of Metempsychosis of great spirits. Wood called Seldon a living library: Eiselein goes to great lengths in explaining the use of this metaphor, giving a Latin epigram on Grotius and a Greek quotation from Gregory Nazianzen. The following paragraph gives Seldon's opinion of Ben Jonson. The whole of the introduction is thus filled with digressions and adorned with quotations from Latin and Greek. There is nothing new in the way of criticism or information. Eiselein's narrative of Butler's life is derived from various easily accessible sources; he quotes at some length opinions concerning Butler from Addison, Dryden, Voltaire, and others.

The account of previous German translations given by Eiselein is of interest. From Bodmer's he quotes two passages, the first fourteen lines and the address to the Muse; but the original is not given and there is no comment. As these are precisely the two samples of Bodmer's version which Gottsched gave in the review to which Eiselein later refers, the suspicion is very strong that Eiselein knew Bodmer's work only through this review. Eiselein makes serious errors in regard to the Waser translation. In the first place, he attributes it to another Johann Heinrich Waser, to the unfortunate theologian and author of that name who was executed at Zürich in 1780. After some information concerning this mistaken Waser, there is a discussion of the translation. Eiselein then places in parallel columns five selections from this

translation¹ and the corresponding passages from Townley's; a German prose translation is compared with one in French verse. Eiselein's examination of Waser's work must have been very superficial; for example, he says that Waser made no use of Grey's edition and seemed not to have known the French translation by Townley. It has been seen above that Waser copied very extensively from Grey's edition and referred several times to Townley's work. Eiselein may have derived the idea that Waser did not know this French translation from a note in the review of Waser's work in the *Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften*.² Attention is there called to the lines,

"Like commendation nine pence crookt
With—to and from my love—it lookt" (I, 487-8),

which Waser failed to understand, and a note is copied from the French translation giving the correct explanation. Waser's failure to make use of this note may have led Eiselein to make the incorrect assertion. Eiselein copied all of Riedel's stanzas, but without other remark than that Riedel conceived the purpose of translating the poem into German rhymed verses, and that from the examples given, the reader could judge whether the failure to complete the work were a loss to letters. He quotes also from the letter to Klotz. Gruber's translation was known to Eiselein only by name.

Eiselein's acquaintance with Soltau's translation was, however, intimate. He makes no mention of the *Mercur* fragment, and probably did not know of it. Four pas-

¹ The passages are I, 1, 91-104, 189-200, 281-286, 453-456; II, 1113-1178.

² II, 1, pp. 273-283, 1766.

sages from the edition of 1787 are quoted, and Soltau's own opinion of his work as expressed in the edition of 1797 is cited. Then Eiselein says that in ten years more Soltau would have thought his second edition as unworthy as the first. He condemns Soltau's rhymes, his freedom in the use of poetic feet, his lack of simplicity and clearness. Yet Eiselein confesses to have embodied a large number of Soltau's lines in his own translation, not because of indolence, but because he was assured that he could do no better. The translator hopes that his readers will everywhere note in his style the beneficent effect of his study of language; and adduces, as proof, the titles of three books which he has written in this field.

Eiselein's notes are a strange chaos of pedantry. About one-fifth of them, and those the most pertinent, are copied from Grey's edition. About half of the notes are quotations from Latin and Greek authors often only remotely relevant, and cited without any attempt to establish any genuine connection with Butler's work. Among the other notes, there are fairly numerous quotations from Shakespeare, and occasionally from other English authors. Eiselein draws also, in numerous cases, on German literature. For example, in the first canto he quotes from Fischart, Steinhöwel, Hartmann von Aue, Friedrich von Husen, Bürger, Kant, and others; similarly in the second canto he introduces Vridank, the *Kölner Chronik*, the *Kaiserchronik*, Naogeorg, Luther, Uz, and Goethe. He goes to Ulfilas for justification of usage and devotes a long note to the explanation of an Alemannic word which he might have used in his translation but did not. Several times he translates his own lines into Latin, and quite a proportion of his notes is in explanation of matters which he himself has thrust into Butler's text. An edition of

Eiselein's version was published a year later with eight plates, but it contained neither the introduction nor the notes.¹

We have thus three complete translations of *Hudibras* into German. Waser's naturally stands by itself because of its form. In general, a prose translation, because of obvious freedom in choice of expression, in expansion and arrangement, can reproduce the exact meaning of the original more easily than a translation in verse. But in the case of Butler's poem, the form in which he has chosen to express his thought becomes in a peculiar way a part of the thought itself,—that is, it is an essential factor in producing the effect which Butler desired, and so influences the attitude of the reader toward the material presented, that a translation of *Hudibras* which disregards the verse-form must necessarily become a relatively unsatisfactory approximation of Butler's work. When

“There was an ancient sage philosopher
That had read Alexander Ross over”

becomes “Es war ein alter Philosoph, der den Alexander Ross gelesen hatte,” a quality has passed out of the lines which is peculiarly Hudibrastic, and without which the translation fails to reproduce the impression made by the original.

Waser translates

¹ Small octavo, pp. 362, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1846. Eiselein's translation is reviewed in the *Wiener Jahrbücher der Literatur*, 1845, Vol. 112, pp. 251-264. The reviewer says that *Hudibras* is little known in Germany, and that Eiselein has performed a distinct service in making so excellent a translation. The introduction is called scholarly. The greater part of this long review is occupied with an account of Butler's life, taken mainly from Eiselein.

“In school-divinity as able
As he that hight Irrefragable
A second Thomas, or at once
To name them all, another Dunce”

as follows: “In der Schul-Theologie wiech er selbst dem Doctor irrefragabilis nicht, war ein zweyter Thomas, oder damit ich sie alle unter einem Namen begreife, ein anderer Dun Scotus.” This may serve as an example of the most natural type of inadequacy in such a translation. There are thus some actual errors in the rendering; but more frequently it is the failure to reproduce the jest which lies beneath the surface. When one considers the difficulties of the poem, one is surprised that the imperfections are not more numerous. The very excellence of Waser’s version may well have proved a barrier to other translations in prose.

The relationship between the two poetical translations was very close. Eiselein’s plunderings of his predecessor, Soltan, prove upon investigation to have been extensive. One is almost justified in calling Eiselein’s work a re-writing of the earlier translation. Eiselein has retained about a third of Soltan’s rhymes; he has kept many lines absolutely unchanged, and many more with trifling alterations. The characteristics of Eiselein as a literary worker have been already indicated. These elements of his literary temper have left their inevitable marks on his translation. His rendering is heavy and awkward; but its awkwardness is not, like that of the original text, the result of deliberate purpose, but of Eiselein’s own intellectual heaviness. His translation of Butler’s jests is successful when the wit is inherent in the matter itself; the manner is less adequately reproduced. The droll epithet and the unusual expression lose much in their German form. The striking contrast involved in the

juxtaposition of genuinely poetic diction and prosaic or even vulgar expressions is largely missed in the translation, which finds a duller level, a middle ground of commonplace phraseology. The narrative passages move slowly as compared with the spirited action in Butler. Eiselein weakens his translation by his confusing attempt to substitute German references for English, or to make allusions more easily intelligible to his readers. For example, in the address to the Muse, Hans Sachs and Schmolke are inserted in place of Withers, Pryn and Vicars. Roger Bacon and Dr. Faust are substituted for Merlin (II, 316), and similar alterations are frequent. Eiselein by implication rebukes Soltau for omission of lines; he himself is also guilty in this regard. For example, the thirty-two lines describing Ralpho's astrological knowledge (I, 589-620) are reduced to eighteen.

The nature of Eiselein's translation, its excellencies and defects, may be best indicated by illustrations. I take quotations mainly from the first canto because it is more familiar. The first lines of the original,

"When civil dudgeon first grew high,
And men fell out they knew not why,
When hard words, jealousies, and fears
Set folks together by the ears,"

are translated,

"Als olim Wahn und Aberwitz
Entglomm Albions Inselsitz,
Wo schwarzer Groll und Volksrumor
Urplötzlich wallten hoch empor."

The following points may be noted: "Wahn und Aberwitz" takes the place of Butler's expressive "dudgeon"; the idea in "civil" is accounted for in "Volksrumor."

The thought of the second line is hardly expressed at all, and the homely expression of the fourth line is not reproduced. "Olim" seems allowable in accordance with Butler's frequent introduction of Latin words. The definite reference to England is also natural in a German translation. "Urplötzlich" contains an added idea.

The familiar passage describing Hudibras's rhetorical accomplishments,—

"For rhetoric, he could not ope
His mouth, but out there flew a trope,
And when he happen'd to break off
I' th' middle of his speech, or cough,
H' had hard words ready to show why,
And tell what rules he did it by:
Else, when with greatest art he spoke
You'd think he talk'd like other folk.
For all a rhetorician's rules
Teach nothing but to name his tools" (I, 81-90)

is translated thus:—

Zum Reden öffnete sich kaum
Sein Maul, so nahm ein Tropus Raum:
Und wenn er manchmal pflag zu husten
Aus Artigkeit, alsogleich mussten
Erprobte Rhetorsregeln zeigen
Warum er husten thät und schweigen.
Kam's aber ihm auf Kunst nicht an,
So sprach er wie ein schlichter Mann:
Und aller Schulwiz, gleich den Spinnen
In Winkel suchte zu entrinnen."

The first part of the translation is faithful and satisfactory, although one misses "out there flew." In the latter part of the quotation the meaning of the original is not completely given.

In the following instance Eiselein gives the spirit of the original, the text being so slightly changed by substitution that the effects are practically identical,—

“Whether the Serpent at the Fall
Had cloven feet or none at all,” (I, 183-4);

translated as,—

“Ob einst die Schlang’ vor Adam’s Falle
Vier Füß’ gehabt nebst Klau und Krallen.”

Another example of substitution is—

“Und er ist weithin so bekannt
Als unsrer Erde Leidtrabant ”

for

“Ill has he read, that never hit
On him in Muses’ deathless writ ” (II, 415-16).

Or

“Der Flickreform stand Kerdon treu,
Bis ihre Mode abgieng, bei:
Wenn er gleichwol statt einer Rize
Am morschen Fell riss hundert Schlize ”

representing

“Fast friend he was to reformation
Until ’twas worn quite out of fashion.
Next rectifier of wry law
And would make three to cure one flaw ” (II, 429-32).

Similar substitutions are frequent.

One or two examples of sustained excellence will be of interest.

- (1) “Whose thread of life the fatal sisters
Did twist together with its whiskers,
And twine so close that time should never
In life or death their fortunes sever,
But with his rusty sickle mow
Both down together at a blow ” (I, 275-280).

- (1) "Der Parcen Hand streng in Geweben
Des Bartes hat und Staates Leben
So dicht versponnen und verflochten,
Dass Zeit und Weil sie nicht vermochten
Zu trennen, bis ein Sensenstreich
Wegmaete Bart und Königreich."
- (2) "Thus clad and fortify'd, Sir Knight
From peaceful home set forth to fight.
But first with nimble active force
He got on the outside of his horse;
For having but one stirrup ty'd
T' his saddle on the further side,
It was so short h' had much ado
To reach it with his desp'rate toe.
But after many strains and heaves
He got up to the saddle-eaves
From whence he vaulted into th' seat
With so much vigour, strength, and heat,
That he had almost tumbled over
With his own weight, but did recover
By laying hold on tail and mane
Which oft he us'd instead of rein." (I, 403-418).

(2) This Eiselein renders,

"Also gerüstet zog der Held
Vom stillen Herd ins wilde Feld,
Nachdem er sich mit Müh und Macht
Auf sein erhaben Thier gebracht.
Ein Stegreif nur am Sattel hieng
Von Länge aber so gering
Dass es den Helden oftmals nekte
Bis er ganz fest im Bügel steckte.
Er setzte an, er stieg und keuchte,
Bis er den Sattel-knopf erreichte,
Und schwang sich dann mit solcher Hiz
Und Kraft hinüber in den Siz,
Dass er vom eigenen Gewicht
Oft überkippte, wenn er nicht
Flugs Mäh'n und Schweif als Surrogat
Ergrif an seines Zügels statt."

The force of the adjectives "nimble" and "desperate," the drollness of the expression "on the outside of his horse," are lacking in the translation; but otherwise it is competent.

In spite of these efforts to translate *Hudibras* into German, Butler's poem seems to have played little or no part in shaping the German mock-epics. The burlesque epics of the eighteenth century in Germany were developed under the influence of Pope and Boileau. Pope's *Rape of the Lock* particularly served as a model for those who tried their hand at this kind of verse.¹ Delicate persiflage in Pope's manner became quite the fashion in the middle decades of the century, and it is of this type of mock-epic that Goethe speaks in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*.²

That *Hudibras*, compared with the *Rape of the Lock* exerted an insignificant influence is explicable from the nature of the poems themselves. The exquisite grace and

¹ See Erich Petzet, *Die deutschen Nachahmungen des Popeschen Lockenraubs*, in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, N. F., iv, pp. 409-433, 1891. Petzet investigates the comic epics of Zachariae, Pyra, Uz, Dusch, Schönaich, and Löwen. In the introduction to his *Fabeln und Erzählungen in Burcard Waldis Manier* (Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1771), Zachariae expressed a regret that the metre "which we call 'Knittelverse,' and in which the English poem *Hudibras* is written," should have so lost its popularity. He thinks it particularly suited to certain types of comic epics and other forms of burlesque poetry. The *Neue Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* and the *Merkur* found in *Melchoir Striegel*, a comic epic by J. F. Ratschky, an imitation of *Hudibras*. The full title was *Melchoir Striegel, ein heroisch-episches Gedicht für Freyheit und Gleichheit*, Wien, 1794. This contained only "die ersten Gesänge"; the complete poem appeared in Leipzig in 1799. The work was evidently inspired by the French Revolution. I have not been able to examine this poem; but the quotations given by the two reviews mentioned above are not in the metre of *Hudibras*. See *Neue Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*, xxvi, p. 170 and *Merkur*, 1799, iii, p. 91.

² Hempel edition, xxi, pp. 23 ff.

wit of Pope's work easily won admiration from those who had been long trained to appreciate those very qualities in French literature. The rougher side of Butler perplexed and repelled. And then further, although much of the satire in *Hudibras* is applicable to all times, still much of the interest in *Hudibras* was local and contemporary. Its satirical thrusts were often intelligible in Germany only after diligent study of religious and social conditions in another country and in another century. The appeal of Butler's poem to the German reading public could be only slight. Many undoubtedly felt this when early attempts at translation were made. Bodmer said with reference to the effort to prevent the publication of Waser's translation: "Man hatte, die Unterdrückung zu rechtfertigen, eingewandt, ein Hudibras für uns wäre Überfluss und unnötig: wir leben nicht mehr in den schwärmerischen Zeiten Karls des ersten."¹ Whatever part individual spite played in this particular matter, it is probable that many were honestly of this opinion. Herder in the *Fragmente über die neuere deutsche Litteratur* implies that in his opinion the Germans are comparatively deficient in humor, and that there is little characteristically fitting for the expression of it in the German language. Humor is, however, peculiarly characteristic of the English, and they are especially fond of it in their literature, "weil diese Laune unübersetzbar und ein heiliger Idiotisme ist." Herder puts *Hudibras* among those works which are in this respect representative. He says further, "an einen deutschen Cervantes, *Hudibras*, *Tristram*, und wie die guten Leute mehr heissen, lässt sich bei unserm *Antonio von Rosalva* bei unserm *Renommisten*, und noch weniger bei andern Schriftstellern gedenken."²

¹ See "Denkmaal."

² *Sämmtliche Werke* (Suphan), II, p. 44-46.

Riedel thought national and individual characteristics inimitable, and mentions Butler in this connection. He says the result would be absurd if a German Superintendent were to imitate Yorick, Oeser to follow Hogarth, or Zachariae to sing like Butler.¹ In another place he queries: "Darf wohl ein Deutscher so schreiben wie Buttler von Hudibras?"² Thus in spite of his great admiration for *Hudibras*, frequently attested in his writings, Riedel followed the lead of Zachariae back to Pope when he wrote his own comic epic in prose, *Der Trappenschütze*.³

Wieland probably first knew of Butler through Bodmer. Waser too became one of Wieland's most intimate friends in Switzerland, though before the time of his translation of *Hudibras*. As editor of the *Merkur*, Wieland received two fragmentary translations of *Hudibras* as contributions to that periodical; and his appreciation of Butler's masterpiece is to be inferred from a letter to Riedel, in which he ascribes his friendship for the latter to similarity of tastes, and mentions as exemplifications of this the fact that *Tristram* and *Hudibras* are Riedel's "Leibbücher."⁴ But Wieland did not take Butler as a model when he wrote his own humorous poetry.

Both Sime⁵ and Erich Schmidt⁶ assert that Lessing and Nicolai planned to write a burlesque epic after the

¹ Letter to Flögel, *Sämmtliche Schriften*, Wien, 1787, iv, p. 32.

² *Sämmtliche Schriften*, III, pp. 157 ff. *Über die Laune*.

³ *Der Trappenschütze, ein komisches Heldengedicht in drei Gesängen, von Humphrey Polesworth, Esq. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt*, Halle, 1765, pp. 48.

⁴ *Auswahl denkwürdiger Briefe*, Wien, 1815, p. 198.

⁵ *Life of Lessing*, Boston, 1871, I, pp. 119-20: "in imitation of *Hudibras*."

⁶ *Lessing*, 2te veränderte Auflage, Berlin, 1899, I, p. 266; "nach dem Muster des *Hudibras*."

pattern of *Hudibras*. Knowledge of this proposed work rests entirely on a note made by Nicolai to Lessing's letters.¹ According to Nicolai the plan was made in the Winter of 1756-7, originating with Lessing; but each was to contribute a humorous scene as it might occur to the one or the other. Nicolai took it upon himself to carry out the scheme in "Knittelverse." The following is an outline of the poem as far as Nicolai remembered it. Gottsched, accompanied by "one of his then well-known disciples" as squire, was to ride forth against the Klopstockian seraphs and angels, "durch welche er und seine Poesie verfolgt." The two arrive at Langensalza at the time of the Gregorius festival and attack the children there who are dressed for this festival as angels. The knight and his companion are thrown into prison and condemned to death as "Hexenmeister." A clergyman visits them in their extremity; but learning the object of their knightly enterprise, he is willing to let them die without any ministrations on his part; for he is an admirer of Klopstock. By chance, Klopstock arrives in Langensalza to visit his Fanny, and succeeds in rescuing the prisoners. As a measure of security, Gottsched is committed to the discipline of his wife, and the squire to his father; and the keepers are to be responsible that the two in the future shall "neither ride nor rhyme." One other scene Nicolai recalled. The knight and his squire fall in with a troupe of strolling comedians. Gottsched asks if they do not play his *Cato*. The players call it one of their chief plays, but assert that they cannot perform it then, because their "lustige Person," who would take the role of Portia, has died, and the new "Hanswurst" has not yet learned the part. Gottsched himself takes the role of Portia.

¹ *Sämmtliche Schriften*, Berlin, 1828, **xxix**, pp. 278-81.

Among some drawings made for this poem, Nicolai thought, by a friend named von Breitenbach, was one representing Gottsched in this part. Nicolai says, however, that the whole matter was more a merry idea which they cherished for a time than a serious purpose.

That the poem was to be an imitation of *Hudibras* is simply inferred by these biographers from the description which Nicolai gives. The account of the plan certainly suggests the possibility, but as Nicolai says nothing of Butler, there is not sufficient evidence for the unqualified statement. Further, Erich Schmidt gives the title of the poem as *Die Poeten*: this inference is not warranted by Nicolai's account. Nicolai said: "Ungefähr zu Ende des Jahres 1756, oder zu Anfange des Jahres 1757 wollte ich mit Lessing gemeinschaftlich ein burleskes Heldengedicht auf Gottsched und auf die Reimer aus seiner Schule machen, die Poeten heissen wollten." In this there is obviously no indication of the title. Schmidt and Sime also say that the squire was to represent Schönaich, which may well have been, but Nicolai says nothing to this effect either.¹

Butler is mentioned by Lessing in the fourth *Literaturbrief*² which was dated, January 11, 1759; and Mendelssohn writing to Lessing, December 26, 1755, in a brief discussion of the nature of burlesque, refers to Butler's comparison of a dawn with a lobster.³ These references show Lessing's acquaintance with Butler at

¹ The Danzel-Guhrauer life of Lessing gives an account of this scheme and is more guarded in its statements: "offenbar dem *Hudibras* nachgebildet" and "der Schildknappe wird ohne Zweifel Schönaich gewesen sein." (I, p. 280).

² *Werke*, Hempel, ix, p. 43.

³ *Werke*, Hempel, xx, 2, p. 31.

about the time of this plan for the burlesque on Gottsched, but indicate nothing more.

In that part of Lessing's *Nachlass* designated as *Selbstbetrachtungen, Einfälle, und kleine Aufsätze* is found the following fragment: "Er füllt Därme mit Sand und verkauft sie für Stricke. Wer? Etwa der Dichter, der den Lebenslauf eines Mannes in Dialogen bringt und das Ding für Drama ausschreit?" The first sentence is supposed to be derived from a passage in *Hudibras*. Boxberger first called attention to this possible source (*Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, iv, pp. 113-4) and the interpretation has been unquestioningly accepted by Redlich in his notes to the Hempel edition,¹ and by Erich Schmidt in his life of Lessing (i, p. 56). The lines in *Hudibras* are,

"For he a rope of sand could twist
As tough as learned Sorbonist" (i, 1, 157).

That Lessing's sentence refers in any way to these lines is, to say the least, somewhat far-fetched.²

Sonnenfels used a quotation from *Hudibras* as a text for an epigram,³ and Goekingk also wrote an epigram on Butler.⁴ Butler is mentioned further by Goekingk in one of his poetical epistles, that "*An Herrn . . . , einen jungen Dichter.*"⁵ Butler was naturally noted in

¹ *Werke*, Hempel, xix, p. 629.

² Kant actually does refer to these lines, however; see Boxberger, in *Archiv*, as before, and Kant *Werke* edited by Rosenkranz and Schubart, Vol. xi, p. 192. Boxberger in the Kürschner *Lessing* (xiv, 2, p. 431), calls attention to the use of this expression, "ropes of sand" in Ben Jonson's *The Devil is an Ass*, I, Scene 1, and V, Scene 2, Baudissin's translation, i, pp. 168, 280.

³ *Schriften*, Wien, 1783-7, ix, p. 120.

⁴ *Gedichte*, Leipzig, 1780-82, iii, p. 241.

⁵ *Gedichte*, Frankfurt, 1780, i, p. 224.

studies by German critics when they treated of humor or satire: as for example, by Blankenburg in his *Versuch über den Roman*,¹ where Butler is numbered among the "Spötter"; or by Garve in his essay, *Über die Laune*;² or by an anonymous writer in an article with the same title in the *Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften*.³ Schubart in his *Vorlesungen über die schönen Wissenschaften* before referred to, calls *Hudibras* "the monarch of comic epics"; a book by Schirach entitled *Über die moralische Schönheit und Philosophie des Lebens*⁴ contains a chapter, *Über die Laune*, in which *Hudibras* is highly praised and called a masterpiece of humor. In his note books, Jean Paul made excerpts from Waser's translation.⁵ Gottlieb Stephanie (der Jüngere) used Butler's presentation of the Roundheads in portraying certain characters in his play, *Die Liebe für den König*.⁶

These are but scattered instances of acquaintance and appreciation; more might be found; yet they could hardly alter the general conclusion concerning *Hudibras* in Germany. The whole case may be summed up as follows. Butler was introduced in the first place by the Swiss, who tried in almost wholesale fashion and often without discrimination to awaken interest in English authors. The fact that *Hudibras* was an English poem which had won great fame and had been praised by later British writers whose taste they esteemed, was sufficient to account for the Swiss effort to bring it to the attention of the German literary world. Appreciation of *Hudibras* was

¹ Leipzig, 1774, p. 205.

² *Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften*, LXI, pp. 51-77.

³ *Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften*, III, pp. 1 ff.

⁴ Altenburg, 1772.

⁵ *Euphorion*, VI, p. 557.

⁶ *Sämmtliche Schauspiele*, Wien, 1776, III, pp. 269-360.

then and remained the possession of those who represented a cosmopolitan culture. The translations were undoubtedly looked upon by their authors and by the publishers as ingenious literary exercises. Indeed, the author of the fragment published in the *Merkur* said that it was not recommended to the German reading public in general but only to those "welche die Übersetzung nach dem Original zu beurtheilen und zu berichtigen Zeit und Lust haben." *Hudibras* is thus an example of a foreign work which is brought in by enthusiasts, is admired by a few who can know and appreciate it in the original, but which, in spite of the translations, remains for the most part a sealed book to the average reader. Hence it exerts little appreciable influence in shaping literary taste, and fails to become a model for native writers.

HARVEY W. THAYER.

FRENCH AND GERMAN GRAMMARS

ELEMENTARY FRENCH

By **FRED D. ALDRICH**, Master in Worcester Academy, and
IRVING L. FOSTER, Professor of the Romance Languages in Pennsylvania State College.

A full course prepared especially for beginners according to the best modern methods of French instruction. It is planned to be easily adapted to the varying conditions of teaching the language. The lessons are topically arranged—grouped in natural relations around a common subject—and the abundant exercises constantly emphasize the essential points in the most interesting manner.

A BRIEF GERMAN GRAMMAR

By **ROSCOE JAMES HAM**, Professor of German at Bowdoin College and **ARTHUR NEWTON LEONARD**, Professor of German at Bates College.

This grammar combines the essential characteristics of
**Conciseness—Completeness—Good Arrangement
and Interest.**

The skilful elimination of all superfluous matter, the careful inclusion of everything needful all show the finish of experience and understanding of class requirements.

GINN AND COMPANY Publishers

Boston

New York

Chicago

London

LATEST PUBLICATIONS.

Bierwirth's Beginning German. New Edition.

By H. C. BIERWIRTH, Ph. D., Assistant Professor in Harvard University. viii + 300 pp. 12mo. 90 cents.

Wholly new sets of exercises have been provided, in addition to those in the previous edition. They are intended to furnish practice in supplying endings, prefixes, suffixes, single words and phrases or single characteristic vowels, needed to complete easy sentences. Their value lies in fixing the student's attention upon the varying forms of words.

Only minor changes have been made in the grammatical part of the new edition.

Witkowski's German Drama of the Nineteenth Century.

By Dr. GEORG WITKOWSKI, Professor in the University of Leipzig. *Authorized Translation from the second German Edition* by L. E. HORN-ING, Professor of Teutonic Philology in Victoria College, Toronto. viii + 226 pp. 12mo. \$1.00.

In the original, this book is considered a very sane and suggestive introduction to the modern German drama. It shows clearly and convincingly the present-day tendency in the appreciation of the later dramatists.

Freytag: Die Journalisten. New Edition.

Edited, with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by CALVIN THOMAS, Professor in Columbia University. x + 224 pp. 16mo. 35 cents.

An entirely new vocabulary edition, the text being reset from the latest German edition.

Racine: Andromaque.

xx + 104 pp. 16mo. 35 cents.

Racine: Britannicus.

xxi + 115 pp. 16mo. 35 cents.

Racine: Athalie.

xix + 110 pp. 16mo. 35 cents.

The above three plays, edited by Professor F. M. WARREN, of Yale, are now published separately as well as combined in one volume.

Hugo: Ruy Blas. New Edition.

Edited by KENNETH MCKENZIE, Professor in Yale University. xxvii + 223 pp. 16mo. 65 cents.

Hills's Spanish Tales for Beginners.

By E. C. HILLS, Professor of Romance Languages in Colorado College. viii + 298 pp. 16mo. \$1.10.

In selecting these stories, three objects have been kept in view: (1) That they have literary merit, (2) that they be interesting and be not too difficult in language and thought, and (3) that they portray modern Spanish life.

Henry Holt and Company

34 West 33d St., New York

378 Wabash Ave., Chicago



REGULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

1. Members wishing to present papers at the meeting are expected to prepare them for that particular purpose. Extremely technical treatises may be read by title. Subjects too large to be treated in an ordinary paper, and topics too special to be of general interest, may be brought before the meeting in the form of abstracts lasting from five to ten minutes. The papers read in full should be so constructed as not to occupy more than twenty (or, at most, thirty) minutes.

2. Every member offering a paper, whether it is to be read in full or not, shall submit to the Secretary, by November 15, with its title, a synopsis of its contents, consisting of some fifty or sixty words. He shall state, at the same time, whether he thinks his paper should be presented by title only, summarized in an abstract, or read in full. The synopses of accepted papers are to be printed on the program.

3. The Secretary shall select the program from the papers thus offered, trying to distribute the matter in such a way as to make all the sessions attractive. In general not more than an hour and a half shall be devoted to the presentation of papers at any one session. There shall be sufficient opportunity for discussion and for social intercourse.

4. The question of publication is to be decided for each paper on its merits as a contribution to science, without regard to the form in which it has been presented at the meeting.

NOTICE.

The Editorial Committee desires additional copies of Vol. xvii, No. 4, New Series, Vol. x, No. 4, and will pay 75 cents for any copy of that number addrest to the Treasurer, Mr. W. G. HOWARD, 25 CONANT HALL, *Cambridge, Mass.*

OFFICERS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICA FOR THE YEAR 1909.

President, MARION DEXTER LEARNED, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Secretary, C. H. GRANDGENT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

*Treasurer, WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.,
Acting Secretary from July 10, 1909, to August 1, 1910.*

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

GUSTAV GRUENER, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

EVERETT WARD OLMSTED, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CENTRAL DIVISION.

Chairman, ARTHUR GRAVES CANFIELD, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Secretary, CHARLES BUNDY WILSON, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

AICÉE FORTIER, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.

CHARLES HARRIS, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

GEORGE HEMPL, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.

JOHN M. MANLY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

LEWIS F. MOTT, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

HENRY A. TODD, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

C. H. GRANDGENT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

CALVIN THOMAS, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

JAMES W. BRIGHT, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

DEC 3 1909
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
Title page

PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

OF

AMERICA

EDITED BY

CHARLES H. GRANDGENT

SECRETARY OF THE ASSOCIATION

VOL. XXIV, NO. 4

NEW SERIES, VOL. XVII, NO. 4

DECEMBER, 1909

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE ASSOCIATION

AT 107 WALKER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

BOSTON POSTAL DISTRICT

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$3.00 A YEAR; SINGLE NUMBERS \$1.00

PRINTED BY J. H. FURST COMPANY

BALTIMORE

Entered November 7, 1902, at Boston, Mass., as second-class matter
under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

XXI.—Symbolism, Allegory, and Autobiography in <i>The Pearl</i> . By WILLIAM HENRY SCHOFIELD,	- - - - - 585-675
XXII.—A Recently Discovered Fragment of an Old French MS. of the <i>Faits des Romains</i> . By H. A. TODD,	- - - - - 676-686
XXIII.— <i>Magnificencia Ecclesie</i> . By HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN,	687-698
XXIV.—A Definition of <i>Petrarchismo</i> . By JOHN M. BERDAN,	- 699-710
XXV.—Source and Analogues of <i>How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad</i> . By C. R. BASKERVILL,	- - - 711-730
APPENDIX.—Proceedings of the Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, held at Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., and at Northwestern Univer- sity, Chicago, Ill., December 28, 29, 30, 1908,	- - - i-xlvi
THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS,	- - - - - xlviii-lxxii
THE CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS,	- - - - - lxxiii-cii
MEMBERSHIP LIST,	- - - - - cviii-clvii

The annual volume of the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* is issued in quarterly instalments. It contains chiefly articles which have been presented at the meetings of the Association and approved for publication by the Editorial Committee. Other appropriate contributions may be accepted by the Committee. The closing number of each volume includes, in Appendices, the Proceedings of the last Annual Meeting of the Association and its Divisions.

The complete sets of the first seven volumes of these Publications are all sold. The subsequent volumes, comprising all the New Series, may be obtained of the Secretary. The subscription for the current volume is \$3.00. The price of single numbers is \$1.00 each.

Copies of the Report of the Committee of Twelve on Admission Requirements may be obtained of the Secretary. The price is ten cents a copy.

In the absence of the Secretary, July 10, 1909, to August 1, 1910, all communications should be addressed to

W. G. HOWARD,
Acting Secretary of the Association,
25 Conant Hall, Cambridge, Mass.

The next Annual Meeting of the Association will be held at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., on December 28, 29, and 30. The Central Division Meeting will be held at the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., on the same days. Attention is called to the regulations printed on the third page of this cover.

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
Modern Language Association of America.
1909.

VOL. XXIV, 4.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XVII, 4.

XXI.—SYMBOLISM, ALLEGORY, AND AUTO-
BIOGRAPHY IN *THE PEARL*.

In 1904 I ventured to write an article entitled "The Nature and Fabric of *The Pearl*,"¹ in which I advanced opinions at variance with those previously held on the subject. Since then have appeared a new edition of the poem, five new English translations of all or a large part of it, and several articles on various aspects of the work.²

¹ *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, XIX, 154-215.

² Ed. C. G. Osgood (*Belles Lettres Series*), Boston, 1906; trans. (in part) S. Weir Mitchell, N. Y., 1906—reprinted, with additions, in *The Bibelot*, Portland, Maine, 1908; trans. G. G. Coulton, London, 1906; trans. (in prose) C. G. Osgood, Princeton, N. J., 1907; trans. Marian Mead, Portland, Maine, 1908; trans. Sophie Jewett, N. Y., 1908. Professor Gollancz has announced a reprint of his edition and translation, to appear in *The King's Classics*.

See also C. S. Northup, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXII (1907), 21 ff.; G. G. Coulton, "In Defence of 'Pearl,'" *Mod. Lang. Review*, II, (1907), 39 ff.; I. Gollancz, *Cambridge History of English Literature*, I, (1907), 320 ff.; J. J. Jusserand, *Literary History of the English People*, 2d Eng. ed., I, 351, n. A. Brandl, *Anfänge der Autobiographie in England*, in *Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, XXXV (1908), 731-2; K. L. Bates, *The Dial*, Dec. 16, 1908, pp. 450 ff.

In no one of these documents has my point of view with regard to the symbolism, allegory, and autobiography in the poem been fully accepted. To be sure, the chief part of former, fanciful speculations regarding the author's life and incentive to composition have not been repeated;¹ but all who have recently *written* about the poem have clung tenaciously to the pleasant belief that *The Pearl* is a personal lament of the poet for a daughter of his own, and therefore strictly elegiac and autobiographical. This belief would be fairly harmless if (because of the primary stress always laid upon it) it did not inevitably obscure the true significance of the poem; but on this account it should not be allowed to establish itself more firmly without frank protest.

If I have been tempted to write again about *The Pearl*, it is because I am afraid that in my previous article I did not make my argument clear enough for those who are unacquainted with mediæval literature, and who could hardly be expected to judge of its conventions without more illustration; and because I recognize that my attitude on certain possibilities was not sufficiently explicit to preclude misunderstanding on the part of scholars whose opinion I highly respect. Besides, I should like to point out certain plain errors in recent discussions of the subject. I have gone over the whole matter again, reluctantly but conscientiously, considered every serious criticism carefully, examined the poem anew from different aspects, and if my further studies have not resulted in any considerable change in my point of view, but only in a somewhat different statement of it, this has not been because I have begun

¹ Save in the case of Professor Gollancz, who has revived his "hypothetical biography" of the poet in the *Cambridge History*, I, 330 ff.

with *parti pris* or proceeded without an open mind. I must confess, to be frank, that I have restudied the poem with scholarly method, though doubtless this will be again imputed to me as a reproach; but my main object has been to examine it as a work of pure literature, which does not, however, mean impressionistically, looking only on the surface, or without historic sense, as if it were a creation of to-day. I write "in defence of *Pearl*" as "a lover of the poem," and I earnestly pray, as Chaucer did long ago of *Troilus*:

"And red whereso thou be, or elles songe,
That thou be understonde, God I beseche."

I.

Before coming to the main questions to be discussed in this article—Symbolism, Allegory, and Autobiography in *The Pearl*—I would ask the reader's indulgence while we consider together at some length the meaning of the opening stanza of the poem, which is naturally regarded by critics as giving its key-note. A correct translation of this stanza, I venture to say, has never been printed; and upon the misunderstanding of the text by the various translators has rested part of the false bias they have received themselves, and conveyed to every new reader, concerning the nature of the elegiac and autobiographical elements in the poem.

The opening stanza is as follows: ¹

"Perle—plesaunte to princes' paye
To clanky clos in gold so clere—
Oute of Oryent, I hardyly saye,

¹ There is no punctuation in the manuscript.

Ne proued I neuer her precios pere.
 So rounde, so reken in vche araye,
 So smal, so smoþe her side; were,
 Queresouever I jugged gemme; gaye
 I sette hyr sengeley in syngl[e]re.
 Allas! I leste hyr in on erbere;
 þur; gresse to grounde hit fro me yot.
 I dewyne, fordolke of luf-daungere,
 Of þat pryuy perle wythouten spot."

These lines quite literally mean:

"Pearl—pleasant to princes' pleasure
 To (en)close cleanly in gold so clear—
 Out of the Orient, I hardily say,
 I never found its precious peer.
 So round, so radiant in each array
 So small, so smooth its sides were,
 Wheresoever I judged gay gems,
 I set it singly in uniqueness.
 Alas! I lost it in an 'arbor';
 Through grass to ground it went from me.
 I dwine, pierced with love's power,
 For that privy pearl without spot."

It will be observed that, if my interpretation of these lines is correct, there is no indication in them of what the poet's real loss is. We may surmise that the pearl he *represents* himself as losing is not to be taken literally, but we are as yet given no hint of what it may betoken. The author's plan is to let the symbolism of his poem disclose itself slowly.

The first mistake that has frequently been made in translating this stanza is to regard "princes" in the first line as a singular noun in the possessive case, the prince mentioned being taken to refer to the Prince of Heaven—whereby a picture has at once been evoked of Christ rejoicing in paradise in the possession of a pearl that He

has received. The early translators of the passage, Dr. Morris¹ and Professor Gollancz,² rendered the line accurately, though Professor Gollancz remarks in a note (p. 107) that "the phrase probably implies 'for *the* Prince's (i. e., God's) delight.'" Dr. Osgood, on the other hand, frankly capitalizes the noun in his text and glossary,³ and says that it means Christ, though admitting that "perhaps as a secondary meaning any prince is implied." In his (prose) translation, Dr. Osgood writes unhesitatingly: "O Pearl, delight of Christ the Prince," introducing the word Christ to establish the supposed meaning.⁴

Dr. Osgood was apparently led into error by the note of Professor Gollancz just quoted,⁵ and by his references to five refrains in the last section of the poem, especially to the last lines of all:

"He gef vus to be His homly hyne,
Ande precious perle; vnto His pay"—

"May He grant us to be servants in His house, and precious pearls unto His pleasure"—to which passages Dr. Osgood also refers in his notes. But both scholars have failed to notice that these supposed parallels are not exact;

¹ *Early Eng. Allit. Poems*, London, 1864, etc., EETS., I, p. ix.

² *Pearl*, London, 1891, p. 3.

³ Edition, pp. 53, 170.

⁴ The translations of Mr. Coulton ("pleasant to princes' pay") and of Miss Mead ("pleasing to prince's will") do not reveal very clearly what the author's ideas on the point were. Miss Jewett's, on the contrary ("Pearl that the Prince full well might prize"), shows agreement with Dr. Osgood's rendering, with still further straining of the sense.

⁵ Be it said, however, to Professor Gollancz's credit, that, as he himself emphasizes (p. 107), he "carefully avoided" translating it so in the text, giving as his reason that "the allegory should reveal itself gradually."

for in no instance in them is there any possibility of misunderstanding the meaning, a preceding "my" or "that" always definitely determining the sense: Pearl in paradise speaks of "*my* Prince" (1164); the dreamer, of "*that* Prince" (1176, 1188, 1189)¹—whereas it lies in the very intent and structure of the poem that "pearl" in the first line should be purely literal, and in the last purely symbolical.²

But if the first line is misleading in most of the translations, the second is still more so. The phrase "to clanly clos" has troubled editors and translators persistently, though it is in fact only a "split infinitive," meaning "to (en)close cleanly."³ Dr. Morris (p. 108) made the "to augmentative, meaning "very"; cf. "most neatly set in gold so clear" (p. ix). Professor Gollancz writes in a note (p. 107): "lit. 'too cleanly enclosed' (i. e., for earthly existence)"; but in his translation he puts "so" ("so deftly set in gold so pure"), apparently not because

¹ Cf. the description of Lady Meed in *Piers Plowman* (Text A, passus II, ll. 11-12):

"Alle hir fyue fyngres . weore frettet with rynges,
Of the precioucest perre (gems) . that *prince* wered euere."

Dr. Osgood himself cites (pp. 54, 53): "The gentileste jowelle ajuggede with *lordes*" (*Morte Arthure*, 862); "Coral ycuð wip cayser and knyht" (Böddeker, *Altengl. Dichtungen*, 145. 7).

² See below, pp. 612, 623 ff., 636.

³ "The author uses "close" (with silent "e") as an infinitive in the following line: "þur, kynde of þe kyste þat hyt con close" (271). There is extreme freedom in the scribe's use of final "e" in the text. The past participle of the verb is "closed" in *Cleanness*, l. 310 ("a cofer closed of tres, clanlych planed"); also "clos" in l. 12 ("if þay in clannes be clos þay cleche gret mede"). In the *Destruction of Troy* (ed. Panton and Donaldson, EETS., 1869) it is *closet* (*closit*), 268, 1509, 1634; in the *Wars of Alexander* (ed. Skeat, EETS., ES. 47, 1886) it is *closid* (*closyd*), 383, 1378, 2912.

he regarded the "t" as a scribal error. Dr. Mitchell has "right cleanly housed in gold so clear"; Mr. Coulton: "so daintily dight in gold so clear"; Miss Jewett: "so surely set in shining gold"—all of these being variants of one of Professor Gollancz's interpretations, but conveying very dim meaning. It was reserved for Dr. Osgood to depart altogether from the text and to put in his translation something totally at variance with what the author wrote: "O Pearl, delight of Christ the Prince; now safe, afar, in his clear regions of pure shining gold"!

It is an interesting study to see how Dr. Osgood arrives at this extraordinary result. Having discussed Professor Gollancz's interpretations of "too" and "so" (the infinitive being always taken for a past participle), he remarks (p. 53): "But *clanly clos* is a common alliterative phrase and *clanly* may thus be used here rather for alliteration than meaning. *To* may thus belong to the more significant *clos*, the sense being 'too fast (though decently) enclosed for my present happiness.' Or *clanly* may mean 'completely,' in which case *to* could modify it." Furthermore, Dr. Osgood is troubled about "the intended figurative meaning of the whole line"¹ and decides that "*golde*

¹ In support of the "intended figurative meaning" discovered in this line, Dr. Osgood quotes as follows a passage from the *Love-Rune* of Thomas de Hales (*Old Eng. Miscellany*, ed. Morris, EETS., 1872, pp. 93 ff.):

"þe ymston [Mary] of þi bur,
He is betere an hundred folde
þan all þeos in heore culur.
He is idon in heouene golde,
And is ful of fyn amur."

I was the first to bring the *Love-Rune* into connection with *The Pearl*, to show the striking resemblance of the latter, in substance and phraseology, to a purely allegorical poem. But I am at a loss to understand how Dr. Osgood could gloss, as above, the "gem-

is probably the coffer, i. e., Paradise." "The line," he adds, "may contain also a secondary allusion to the maiden's tomb The poet may have provided costly sepulture for the child." This is bad enough; but what shall we say of the imaginative interpretation of the line by Miss Mead, who translates it: "set all-too sweetly in clearest gold," and suggests (p. xvi) that here the "glory of gold" of the maiden's "shining hair" is "tenderly hinted at" ?

In this instance, as in many others in the interpretation of *The Pearl*, one must keep one's mind clear or one will soon cease to separate what the poet says from what appreciative critics read into his lines. Here is no word at all about a golden tomb for a maiden, or the glorious gold of her shining hair. No maiden has as yet been men-

stone" of the poem as "Mary," when it stands for "maidenhood." Note the following lines:

"þis ilke ston þat ich þe nemne
 Mayden-hod icleoped is.
 Hit is o derewurþe gemme;
 Of all oþre he berþ þat pris,
 And bryngeþ þe wiþ-vte wemme
 In-to þe blysse of paradis.
 þe hwile þu hyne witest vnder þine hemme
 þu ert swettur þan any spis."

"Hwat spekstu of eny stone
 þat beoþ in vertu oþer in [grace],
 Of amatiste, of calcydone,
 Of lecturie and tupace,
 Of iaspe, of saphir, of sardone,
 Smaragde, beril, and crisopace,
 Among alle oþre ymstone
 þis beoþ deorre in vyche place."

Note that the author compares one gem—an allegorical virtue, Maidenhood—to various others, and says that, in his opinion, it surpasses them all.

tioned. So far we have nothing more than the plain statement (in the true style of the lapidary, as we shall see): "Pearl is a gem that princes delight to set in clear gold." The second line is not "vague," as Dr. Osgood believes, and it has no "intended figurative meaning," or "secondary allusions."

The third and fourth lines read literally:

"Out of the Orient, I hardily say,
I never found its precious peer."

This Professor Gollancz translates:

"From Orient lands, I durst avouch,
Ne'er saw I a gem its peer."

which, save for a possible mistake, regarding the connection of the opening clause, conveys the right meaning. But other translators put "her" for "its," and most introduce "pearl." For example, Dr. Osgood writes: "Truly no pearl of the Orient have I ever found her peer in price." As a matter of fact, the statement probably is not that the girl (who has not yet been mentioned), or any particular pearl (for, apparently, the author has not yet got beyond the general), surpasses either any gem, or any other pearl of the Orient—but simply, that the author believed Oriental pearls to be peerless among valuable gems.¹ The

¹ I have written "a possible mistake." It may be I who am mistaken. The opinion I have reached, after long consideration of the passage and especially in the light of the lapidaries (on which see what follows), is that the author begins with statements concerning the gem pearl in general and then shifts in line nine (rather abruptly, to be sure) to statements concerning the particular pearl which he had *in mind* from the beginning to use as a symbol. On the contrary, it may well be held that he is speaking of this particular pearl throughout the stanza, and the "were" in line six

limitation, "out of Orient," was probably made to indicate that he did not refer to native British pearls, which, then as now, were not prized like the perfect, lustrous pearls of the East.¹

The next point to be noted is the use of the possessive pronoun. In the first stanzas we find in the unique manu-

and the definite "hyr" (it) in line nine would support this interpretation; yet I cannot make the opening lines fit such an explanation comfortably. There is evident difficulty whichever view one takes, and my argument does not depend on the correctness of either. The important fact I wish to establish here is that there is no mention of any *maiden* in any part of the stanza.

According to my view, "out of Orient" is equivalent to "when out of the Orient," i. e., the author simply makes here the regular limitations of "Oriental pearl" in his superlative statements about the gem. This limitation is constant in mediæval literature. In *The Pearl* itself, the girl is said to wear a "crown of pearl Orient" (255), and we read of "precious pearls of Orient" (82). Cf. pp. 598, 602, 653 n. 1, 660 f. According to the alternative view, the translation of Dr. Osgood (as quoted) would convey the correct sense, except for the unjustifiable use of "her" in the line.

¹Pliny says in his *Natural History* (Bk. ix, ch. 57): "It is a well-ascertained fact that in Britannia pearls are found, though small, and of a bad colour" (trans., Bohn Library, II; see note, p. 437). In Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, 1594, p. 235, we read of "rich Orient pearl," "more bright of hue than were the Margarets that Cæsar found in wealthy Albion."

Messrs. Kunz and Stevenson write, in *The Book of the Pearl* (N. Y., 1908, p. 160): "In the twelfth century there was a market for Scotch pearls in Europe, but they were less valued than those from the Orient. (See Nicolai, *Anglia Sacra*, II, 236; *Alberti Magni Opera Omnia*, ed. A. Borgnet, Paris, 1890, v, 41) An ordinance of John II, King of France, in August, 1355, which confirmed the old statutes and privileges of goldsmiths and jewellers, expressly forbade mounting Scotch pearls and Oriental pearls together in the same article, except in ecclesiastical jewelery. ("Orfèvre ne peut mettre en oeuvre d'or ne argent parles d'Ecosse avec parles d'Orient, si ce n'est en grand joyaulx d'église")—See *Histoire de l'Orfèvrerie-Joaillerie*, Paris, 1850, p. 146; De la Borde, *Enaux*, Paris, 1852, II, 437)."

script of the poem (probably a copy of a copy) *her* (*hyr*) and *hit* used indiscriminately, which is simply due to the fact that the word "pearl" was feminine and *her* was correctly used, yet *hit* was perhaps more natural as applied to an inanimate object. On this point Professor Gollancz wrote, much to his credit (p. 107): "I have carefully avoided using the feminine pronoun in my rendering of the opening of the poem; the allegory should reveal itself gradually It must be borne in mind, however, that the feminine pronoun would not strike a mediæval reader as conspicuously as a modern one; but at the same time it is noteworthy that the poet frequently uses the indefinite *hit*, e. g., in ll. 11; 4. 5; etc." Dr. Osgood points out (p. 54) that in *Cleanness* (1117-1128) "the fem. pron. only is used of the pearl, and that too without any evident personification." He thinks this "remarkable": "the sudden change from the neuter pronoun (cf. 13. 41) indicates an imperfect identification of the symbol with the object symbolized." The fact is: either *her* or *hit* could be used of the gem pearl, but only *her* could properly be used of the girl Pearl.¹ The girl is plainly not spoken of here; and yet—this is the point I wish now to emphasize—almost all recent translators have used the feminine pronouns *she* and *her*, as if there was no question that the girl Pearl was here definitely referred to, whereas, I repeat, no maiden of any name or nature has as yet been mentioned.

Following this same principle, all translators have made an effort to transform a general description of the gem into one of a girl. Literally, lines five and six read:

¹ If *hyt* is used in ll. 283-4 and 377 it is because the symbolism of the lost gem pearl is definitely in the poet's mind; cf. the use of *ho*, *hyr*, etc., in stanzas 14-19.

“ So round, so reken (radiant) in each array
So small, so smooth its sides were.”

No one has ventured to change altogether the first adjective, though “round” is hardly a flattering term to apply to a girl. Dr. Mitchell, in perplexity, wrote “rounded,” hinting at “well-rounded,” an adjective of commendation for a girl of accomplishments. “Reken in vche araye,” being more indefinite, has given more scope to the translators. The phrase probably means “radiant in every way,” or “ray.”¹ It has been translated:—Gollancz: “comely-shaped withal” (this “withal,” a mistranslation of “vche araye,” was probably to militate against the disagreeable impression of rotundity); Coulton: “so comely every way”; Mitchell: “in such rare array”; Mead: “so purely radiant still” (the “still” is obscure, if it means anything); Osgood: “radiant and unchanging (a prose translation has not the excuse of verse for foisting in an epithet “unchanging” without any justification in the text; yet in his glossary Dr. Osgood translates: “in vche araye, *at all times*”); Jewett: “so radiant to mine eyes” (again the personal touch without any warrant).

Line six reads: “so small, so smooth her (its) sides were.” This remains with literal exactness in Gollancz and Coulton, save “her” for “its,” the latter being necessary to accord with the usage of modern English. Mead has for the first adjective “small of mould”; Jewett, “small to hold”; Osgood, “tender” (why?). For “smooth sides” Mitchell has “smoothen comeliness”; Jewett, “so smooth she seemed” (meaning?—nothing

¹ By a slight emendation of the text. Dante emphasizes the little spheres “che insieme Più s’abbelivan coi mutui rai.” Cf. “full many a gem of purest ray serene”; “ryal ray” (l. 160).

about sides); Osgood, "slight of form" (why?—Dr. Osgood quotes passages in romances of ladies who had small waists). What efforts to make the statement in the line suitable to a girl when it was only intended to apply to a gem!

These adjectives give the staple of description of a pearl "withouten spot," the obvious qualities of its beauty—round, radiant in every way (or ray), small, with smooth sides. In lives of St. Margaret, as Dr. Osgood points out,¹ the pearl is described as "candida, parva," "little and round also," "round and small"; etc. In *Cleanness* we read of the pearl: "For ho (she, it) schynes so schyr þat is of schap rounde." In *The Pearl* itself, the symbolism of the pearl of great price is partly based on the fact that it is "wemleȝ (spotless), clene, & clere, & endeȝ rounde, & blyȝe of mode" (737). Because of the parallelism between the gem and the girl, which the author tries later to enforce, he is led to write of the latter as "so smoȝe, so smal, so seme slyȝt" (190), a line which Dr. Osgood translates thus strangely: "so soft, so slight, so fair and winsomely tender" (p. 10).

If there had been any difficulty about the meaning of the first six lines, it should have been ended by the straightforward statement in lines seven and eight, which sum up the preceding description:

"Wheresoever I judged gay gems"
I set it (the pearl) singly in uniqueness."

Professor Goliancz, with all his care to avoid personal touches by anticipation, nevertheless here introduces "my" before pearl; likewise Dr. Osgood: "At all times when I

¹ Pp. xxxii, 54; cf. Pliny, Bk. ix, ch. 56, on the merit of pearls.

have appraised bright gems, *her* I have set apart and alone"; and Miss Jewett:

"Among all jewels judges wise
Would count *her* best a hundred fold.

In these renderings the author's emphasis on his own particular point of view is neglected. He is simply stating his personal preference. He does not assert (in the words of the *Morte Arthure*) that the pearl is "the gentileste jowelle ajuggede with lordes," but simply states first that "princes" were pleased to set pearls in gold, and then that, *as for him*, he thought the pearl unique among gay gems.¹

We remember in this connection the notable passage in *Cleanness*, a work pretty certainly by the author of *The Pearl*:

"Perle praysed is prys, þer perre is schewed,
þa; hym not derrest be demed to dele for penies.
Quat may þe cause be called, bot for his clene hwea,
þat wynnes worschyp abof alle whyte stones?
For ho schynes so schyr þat is of schap rounde,
Wythouten faut oper fylþe gif ho fyn were."²

¹ One is reminded of the charming *ballade* by Froissart, with the refrain: "Sur toutes fleurs j'aime la marguérite." For example:

"Sur toutes fleurs tient on la rose belle
Et en après, je crois la violette,
La fleur de lis est belle et la perselle,
La fleur de glay (*glaioul*) est plaisante et parfette
Et plusieurs sont qui aiment l'ancolie,
Le pyomer, le muquet, la soussie;
Chacune fleur a par soi son mérite;
Mais je vous dit, tant que pour ma partie,
Sur toutes fleurs j'aime la marguérite."

Paradys d'Amours, ll. 1627 ff. (ed. Scheler, *Oeuvres de Froissart*, I, 49); modernized Faguet, *Lit. Hist. of France*, N. Y., 1907, p. 104.

² *Early Eng. Allit. Poems*, ed. R. Morris, London, 1864, EETS., I, ll. 1117 ff.

Of course, putting the pearl first among gems was a matter of individual taste. Lydgate thought the ruby surpassed all jewels:

“þe rubie briȝt
Of al stones in beaute and in siȝt,
As it is know, haþ þe regalie.”¹

But in this he was merely following the lapidaries. For example, in that of Philippe de Valois, we read: “Li *rubis* est vermax et vaint totes les merveilles de pierres. Li livre nous dient que li gentilz rubis fins et nez ce est li sires des pierres, ce est la jame des james, et il a la vertu des pierres precieuses par desor toz.”²

In the *Lapidaire en Vers*,³ we read:

<p>“L’auctoritez, qui nous aprent Don ruby ou nus ne se prent De biauté, d’estre gracieus, Dist que c’est li plus precieus Des masles et fumeles pierres Des douze dont Dieux fu crieres Quant cria toute creature. Ensi com nous avons appris A li rubys la signorie D’oir en oir et d’ancisserie” (ll. 261 ff.)</p>	<p>“Par son (Christ’s) command- ment fu mis Au col Aaron li rubys, Li sires des pierres clamez, Li prisiés rubys, li amez, Li gentis de joiant coulour, Nule pierre a li ne se prent: De biau tans allume et esprent Sa coulour; biaux est, clers et fins De sa biauté n’est nule fins” (ll. 877 ff.)</p>
---	---

Nor should it be forgotten that the author of the *Love-Rune* compares the allegorical gem Maidenhood, which he celebrates, with other precious stones,⁴ and decides:

¹ *Temple of Glas*, ed. Schick, London, 1891, EETS. ES. LX, ll. 259 ff. Henry V wore in his helmet at the battle of Agincourt the famous ruby of the Black Prince, to whom it is said to have been given by Dom Pedro, King of Castille, after the battle of Nájera, near Vittoria, 1327 A. D.

² L. Pannier, *Les Lapidaires Français*, Paris, 1882, p. 295.

³ Pannier, pp. 246, 264.

⁴ See above, pp. 591-2.

“He is o derewurpe gemme,
Of alle opre he berp þat pris.”

As is well known, “lapidaries” were extremely popular in the Middle Ages.¹ If we bring the opening stanza of *The Pearl* into connection with these, we note several points of interest which help our understanding of the poem:

1. Like the lapidaries in general, our poem opens with the name of the gem to be described. In the first French

¹The Latin poem *De Gemmis* by the Abbot Marbodius (Marbœuf), who was made Bishop of Rennes in 1081, and died c. 1124, was the basis of all the mediæval lapidaries. Edited Migne, *Patr. lat.*, t. 171, col. 1725; Beckmann, Göttingen, 1799; (with translation) C. W. King, *Antique Gems*, 2nd ed., London, 1866, pp. 389 ff. Full information concerning the poem in Pannier; cf. p. 20: “Le lapidaire de l’évêque Marbode n’eut pas seulement un immense succès dans sa rédaction originale latine, il ne resta pas seulement sous cette forme le grand poème pédagogique du moyen âge sur les pierres précieuses, et, jusqu’ à la fin du XVI^e siècle, le manuel classique des écoles de pharmacie; on le traduisit très-anciennement dans presque toutes les langues de l’Europe occidentale.”

It may be noted that the author of *The Pearl* shows (in *Clean-ness*, 1124 ff., Gollancz, p. xxviii) knowledge of the treatment of pearls as gems, giving a receipt for restoring their lustre when they grow dim (cf. Pliny, Bk. ix, ch. 56):

“It becometh never the worse for wear,
be it ne’er so old, if it remain but whole.
If by chance ’tis uncared for and becometh dim,
left neglected in some lady’s bower,
wash it worthily in wine, as its nature requireth:
it becometh e’en clearer than ever before.”

He also refers (ll. 553-4) to another gem by way of comparison:

“As the bright burnished beryl ye must be clean
that is wholly sound and hath no break.”

In the *Lapidaire* (Pannier, p. 123) we read:

“Bericle li Englois le claimment
Qui mout le prisent et mout l’aimment.”

lapidary there are sixty sections, and in forty-seven of these the gem treated is the first word. The following passages will serve as examples:¹

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>“<i>Saphir</i> est bels e cuvenâble,
En déi de rei resplendissable.”</p> | <p>“<i>Esmaragde</i> par sa culur
Veint tutes chioses de verdur.”</p> |
| <p>“<i>Calcedoines</i> est piere jâlue
Entre iacint e beril meâne
Mult est e preisée e amée,
E de riche gent renumée.”</p> | <p>“<i>Beril</i> est en Inde trouvée,
E par sis angles est formée
Pur avoir en granniur clarté,
E si enn a granniur belté.”</p> |

In order to enforce the likeness of such descriptions to the opening of *The Pearl*, I would quote at greater length from the statements concerning the sapphire in a Cambridge (Anglo-French) version of the *Lapidaire*:²

“Saphirs est bons et bauls en dei,
Si l'aiment mult li plusor roi,
Kar il est clers, et sa bealté
Semble le ciel et sa clarté.
En Libye en unt une manire
Que il trovent en la gravire . . .
Huem les apele par figure
Les seinz de gemmes par bon dreit,
Pur les vertuz que avoir deit . . .
Cil plaist a Deu ki chastement
Le porte sanz ordeielement.
Pur pais faire est merveilluse;
Sur tutes gemmes precieuse . . .
Bien li comant que il net seit
Cil ki sur li porter la deit.”

It will be observed how the author explains that the sapphire (which is often joined with the pearl) is beloved by kings to wear on their fingers, particularly because of

¹ Pannier, pp. 39, 41, 45.

² Pannier, p. 149.

its clearness; it is found in the Orient (Libya); it is called symbolically (*par figure*) "the saint of gems," and for certain purposes (*e. g.*, "to make peace") is "precious above all gems"; because of its "virtues," it should be worn "chastely" by those who are "clean" (*net*).

The oldest lapidary has the following lines *De Margaritis*:¹

"En Inde naist en un peisún
Une pierre ke perle a num.
Unió á num pur ce k'est sule . . .
Blanches e clères sunt les perles . . .
En Inde naist e en Britanie
K'on apele la primeraine . . .
Mielz valt la clere ke l'oscure.
Li bon perrier ancienúr
Tindrent la ruunde a meillúr."

Of course, the etymology "Unio, the unique gem"² is incorrect, but it was evidently current in the fourteenth century, and it may have strengthened in the poet's mind the idea of the "uniqueness" of the pearl. In any case, not only because each pearl was found singly, but also because of the gem's qualities, he put it "singly in uniqueness."

2. In the Cambridge version, where the description of the origin of "perle blanc" is lengthened, and emphasis laid on the pearls to be found "en Bretaigne la loée, Qui Engleterre est clamée," we read:

"La conche clot quant la mer vient,
Avec le flot sa voie tient
Igoe ke conceü avra
Piere blanche devendra:
Mult par est bele sa blanchor,
En or a mult bele color."

¹ Pannier, p. 65.

² Pliny, Bk. ix, ch. 56.

Here the last line is particularly to be noted; for it states the proper setting of the pearl.

Our poem has, however, closest connection with the allegorical *Lapidaire en Vers*, beginning "Cil qui aimment pierres de pris," where, it is interesting to observe, the last line of the section describing each stone frequently states the setting it should have.¹ For example: 1. "En or doit jagonce seoir"; 2. Topaz—"David dit que seur or doit estre"; 3. Emerald—"En bon or assise la port"; 4. Ruby—"Et si la doit on en or mettre"; 5. "Li saphyrs doit seoir en or"; 6. "Jaspes doit seoir en argent"; 7. "Lygures doit en or gesir." Even so, in the second line of our poem, the author indicates that pearls should be set "in golde." We are not concerned with whether we should make such a remark to-day or not; it is plainly like the comments of the mediæval lapidary.²

3. It should be noted further that in the *Lapidaire* (1363 ff.) there is an orderly enumeration of the twelve stones that St. John saw in the foundations of the New Jerusalem, such as occurs in stanzas 84-85 of *The Pearl*, as well as parallels of the descriptive adjectives used. For example, "the topaz twin-hued" is explained (without going to Bede) by the *Lapidaire*:

"Plus est de coulour esmerez
D'or et d'asur est coulerez" (757-8).

One is also struck by the similar constant references in the *Lapidaire* to St. John and the Apocalypse, which form

¹ Similar statements appear in the prose lapidary prepared for Philippe de Valois (Pannier, pp. 294, 297).

² It will be remembered, from the passage above quoted (p. 591, note), that the allegorical gem "Maidenhod" in the *Love-Rune* was "set in the gold of heaven."

the refrain of stanzas 82-86 in *The Pearl*, where the enumeration of the twelve stones is found. And the word "devise," which recurs in connection with it ("as deuysez hit þe apostel John," etc.) is repeatedly found in the same connection in the *Lapidaire*.¹ Critics make much of the absence of references to the apocrypha, etc., in *The Pearl*; the situation is the same in the *Lapidaire*.

4. Finally, it may be mentioned here that the general likeness of part of *The Pearl* to the lapidaries might prepare us at once to expect allegory in the poem, "significations" of any and every sort, some to our minds very strained and far-fetched. In the mystical *Lapidaire en Vers*, the twelve stones of Aaron's breastplate, and therefore of special Scriptural emphasis, are treated first with reference to their "nature," and afterwards with reference to their "significance."

"Mult ont vertus, mult senefient,
De par Dieu vertueuses sont.
Pluisors seneflances ont,
Mais lor significations
Est droite predications,
Qui bien s'en vauroit entremetre" (676 ff.).

To illustrate this important point, a few examples may be given: ²

¹ Cf. "La bible et Sains Jehans nous dit" (708); "Sains Jehans en l'apocalypse Nous dit" (730); "Ce nous dist li verais legistres Sains Jehans (810); "Sains Jehans dist tout a delivre En l'apocalypse son livre" (837);—"Devise Sains Jehans," (1445); "Li lapidaires nous devise" (269); "Ci com li livres nous devise" (647); "Que je vous devisai avant" (844); "Ce nous devise" (1231); "Trop i averoit long devis" (1418); etc.

² Pannier, pp. 258 ff.—"Surtout le but de ces oeuvres, c'est de faire passer, sous le couvert des idées reçues sur les pierres, des exemples de morale et d'édification et en même temps d'initier les âmes au mysticisme" (p. 209).

La senefiance dou rubys.¹

“ Moyses en son livre escrist
 Qu’il senefia Ihesu Crist
 Qui vint en terre cheminer,
 Son obscur peuple enluminer;
 Lor tenebres enlumina
 Quant il en terre chemina
 Sains Jehans meisme le dist
 De la venue Ihesu Crist
 Qui dou diable fu hale.
 Au peuple redist Isaie
 Ciaus qui en tenebres estoient
 Lumiere et grant clarté verro-
 ient.
 Diex, qui enlumine le monde,
 Premier en la tire seconde
 Le ruby metre commanda;
 De sa clarté tout amenda.

Au col Aaron sans doutance
 Fu mis en tel senefiance,
 Sains Jehans en sa glose dist
 Que le bel ruby pas ne vit
 Ou haut fondement precieus,
 Car li dous vrais Diex glorieus
 Est entre ses amis tous jors,
 Nus ne set nul de ses sejors:
 Une heure en cor, autre en
 milieu;
 Ainsi n’a point de propre lieu.
 Qui de quant que il a l’ounore
 Et Dieu et sainte eglise aoure
 Ne puet estre deshonzorez;
 Partout doit Diex estre aourés.
 De quant que il a chascun donne
 Et de quant qu’il nous aban-
 donne.”

La senefiance dou topasce.

“ Oh nueme fondement fut mise
 De la pardurable cité
 Dont saint Jehans dist verité,
 A ses dis se fait bon amordre;
 Ce senefia la nueme ordre
 Des angles qui en cele vie
 Vivent, n’ont de nule autre
 envie:

Ce est la vie renommée
 Se n’est rois ou roines non,
 Car tout sont coroné par non.²
 Ou il n’entre ne nez ne née
 Rois doit mult volentiers gar-
 der
 Le doit thopasce et esgarder:
 Bone ramembrance li done

¹ Pannier, pp. 265-6; ll. 889 ff.

² Cf. *Pearl*, 445 ff.:

“ The court of þe kyndom of God alyue
 Hatz a property in hyt self beyng:
 Alle þat may þerinne aryue
 Of alle þe reme is quen oþer kyng,
 & neuer oþer ȝet schal depyue,
 Bot vchon fayn of oþerez hafyng
 & wolde her corounez wern worþ þo fyue
 If possyble were her mendyng.”

Qu'il gart a la haute corone.	Ne puet chaloir de li polir.
Tuit cil qui pluisors pierres	Par ce ne puet on pas tolir
gardent	Sa force, mais por cele vie
Tous jours ou thopasce resgar-	Qui n'a cure d'estre polie
dent,	De richesse d'or ne d'argent
Plus tost que as autres vettes	Le dist saint Jehans a la gent,
Et plus i tornent lor vettes;	Et dist: plus vaut la plus
Et savez que ce senefie?	petite
On doit regarder a la vie	Joie de cele vie eslite
Qui durra adès, que c'on face,	Que ne fait trestout li delis
Que on voit Dieu en la face.	Qui est dedans cest monde mis.
Li thopasce tels com il naist	A cele vie fait bon tendre;
Est mieudres, mais tant pas ne	Mult i devroit chascuns en-
plaist;	tendre." (762 ff.)

La senefiance dou saphir.

"Li saphyrs nous ramentoit	Dou ciel qui tant par est joi-
l'estre	euse,
Et l'estage dont cil s'aprochent	Et douche et digne et glorieuse.
Qui au verai soleil atouchent,	Sains Jehans vit secondement
C'est Jesu Cris; cil qui em-	Ceste pierre ou haut fondement
prennent	Ou ele fu seconde mise:
Dieu a amer forment se pren-	La seconde vertu promise
nent	Senefia, c'est esperance,
An celestial regne querre	Et por ceste senefiance
Et moult entendent au con-	Fu mis en la seconde tire
querre;	D'Aaron; la saphyrs nous tire
Et ausi con la gloire haute	Et ramentoit la grant hautesce
Mest nostre veüe en defaute,	Dou ciel, que par notre peresce
Que nus ne puet ciel deviser	Perdons a avoir; peu i tendent
Ne la hautesce raviser,	Li plusor, et peu i antendent.
Ausi nous faut entente et voie	Diex! si peu i antent mais nus!
D'entendre a la gloire et la joie	Et si n'est nule joie plus:
	C'est la joie qui tous jors dure."
	(932 ff.)

These passages are perhaps unnecessarily long for the erudite; but those who are ignorant of the absurdities of the pseudo-science which passed muster in the Middle Ages, and the mystical allegorization of almost everything in the Bible then commonly indulged in by dignitaries of

the Church, need visible demonstration to convince them that such things could be. It is hard for us moderns to take the allegorical lapidaries of the fourteenth century seriously; but that we must do, if we would enter into the mood of the author of *The Pearl* when he composed his work. Chaucer refers to "the Lapidaire"¹ as a familiar treatise on the "fynest stones faire"; though there is nothing to indicate exactly what version he used. But our author, it is evident, was zealously Christian, and, like churchmen of all degrees in succession before him, he saw "sermons in stones" and pointed out their mystical significance. It is not in the method of thought itself so much as in its subtlety of development and in its artistic setting that *The Pearl* differs from the lapidary. But how great is the gulf between them in excellence!

To illustrate further the opening line, and to show the contemporaneousness of the poem, it may be explained that *The Pearl* was written in what has been called "the pearl age" because of the bewildering popularity of the gem at that time. Recent writers² have made clear that pearls were then particularly favored by *princes*, that many fourteenth-century rulers in Europe had superb specimens in their crowns,³ regalia, or adornment, that they gave pearls away to their peers in lavish abundance, while at the same time they made enactments to prevent the use of the gem by common people.

¹ *House of Fame*, ll. 1350 ff.

² G. F. Kunz and C. H. Stevenson, in their work of rare value and interest, *The Book of the Pearl, The History, Art, Science, and Industry of the Queen of Gems*, New York, 1908.

³ The crown of Alfred the Great, that of Edward the Confessor (reproduced as the official crown of England), and the present crown of Scotland (used at the coronation of Robert Bruce's son, David II, 1324-76) were all largely decorated with pearls (*l. o.*, pp. 418-19; cf. p. 15). Cf. Pliny, Bk. ix, ch. 58.

In the *Travels of Marco Polo*, which the author of *The Pearl* probably knew, we hear a good deal about pearls as well as other jewels, as the ornaments of princes, in the East. For example, in Bk. III, ch. 20,¹ we read of the pearls in the province of Maabar:

"The greater proportion of the pearls obtained from the fisheries in this gulf, are round, and of a good lustre Independently of the tenth of the pearls to which the king is entitled, he requires to have the choice of all such as are large and well-shaped; and as he pays liberally for them, the merchants are not disinclined to carry them to him for that purpose.

"The king is honourably distinguished by various kinds of ornaments, such as a collar set with jewels, sapphires, emeralds, and rubies, of immense value. He also wears, suspended from the neck and reaching to the breast, a fine silken string containing one hundred and four large and handsome pearls and rubies on each arm he wears three gold bracelets, adorned with pearls and jewels; on three different parts of the leg, golden bands ornamented in the same manner; and on the toes of his feet, as well as on his fingers, rings of inestimable value. To this king it is indeed a matter of facility to display such splendid regalia as the precious stones and the pearls are all the produce of his own dominions."

In Bk. II, ch. 38, we read also that in the Province of Kain-du "there is a large lake of salt water, in which are found abundance of pearls, of a white colour, but not round. So great, indeed, is the quantity, that, if his majesty permitted every individual to search for them, their value would become trifling; but the fishing is prohibited to all who do not obtain his license."²

If we come, however, from the Orient to England in our poet's time, we find that there also pearls were particularly beloved by princes. M. Jusserand gathered from "Issues of the Exchequer" the following information

¹ Ed. H. Yule, London, 1871; cf. also Bk. III, ch. 2.

² There was a popular French lapidary that went under the name of Sir John Mandevile, perhaps because it had so much to say of Oriental stones (ed. Is. del Sotto, Vienna, 1862; see Pannier, pp. 189 ff.).

concerning Edward III: "He gives his mistress Alice Perrers 21,868 large pearls, and thirty ounces of smaller ones. His daughter Margaret receives from him two thousand pearls as a wedding present."¹

As we read in *The Book of the Pearl*:

"The returning Crusaders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the development of the knightly orders, had much to do with spreading through Europe a fondness for pearls in personal decoration. Those who, like Chaucer's Knight, had been with Peter, King of Cyprus, at the capture and plunder when "Alexander was won," returned to their homes with riches of pearls and gold and precious stones. And learning much relative to decorative art from Moorish craftsmen, the jewelers of western Europe set these in designs not always crude and ineffective" (p. 19).

"In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries throughout Europe pearls were very fashionable as personal ornaments, and were worn in enormous quantities; the dresses of men as well as of women were decorated and embroidered with them, and they were noted in nearly every account of a festive occasion, whether it were a marriage, a brilliant tourney, the consecration of a bishop, or the celebration of a victory in battle."

"Among the greatest lovers of pearls in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were the members of the ducal house of Burgundy, and especially Philip the Bold (1342-1404) Members of the related houses of Anjou and Valois also held great collections. Nor in this account should we omit some of the English sovereigns, including especially Richard II (1366-1400), one of the greatest dandies of his day" (pp. 21-22).

"The inventories of jewels and ornaments belonging to the kings and queens of France, to the nobility, and to the treasures of the Sainte-Chapelle, in Paris, and of the abbey and church of St. Denis, all mention a large number of objects decorated with pearls" (p. 425).

The authors give abundant examples from the 14th century of pearls set in gold owned by Louis, Duke of Anjou, the Duke of Berri, and others.

¹ *Lity. Hist. of Eng. People*, I, 264.

"The inventory of the personal property of Marguerite, Countess of Flanders, the mother of the Duke of Burgundy, was made in 1405. In this inventory we have a list of an immense number of ornamental objects of every sort and kind, and everything from the ducal crown to the smallest trinket, is garnished with pearls. In most cases the number of pearls is given, and we find that no less than 4494 are enumerated. Evidently the duchess was ever ready to honor the precious gem to which she owed her name, and fully recognized its poetical significance" (p. 426).

It is not without interest to see how some of our later English poets have regarded the gem from this point of view:

a) In *Hamlet*, v, 2, King Claudius (alluding to the medicinal quality of the gem) says:

"The King shall drink to Hamlet's better breath;
And in the cup an *union* [*i. e.*, a *Unio* pearl] shall he throw,
Richer than that which *four successive kings*
In Denmark's crown have worn."

b) *Antony and Cleopatra*, II, 5:

"I'll set thee in a shower of gold, and hail
Rich pearls upon thee."

c) *The Faithful Shepherdess* (1611):

"*Orient pearls fit for a queen*
Will I give thy love to win
And a shell to keep them in."

d) Milton, *Paradise Lost*:

"The gorgeous East with richest hand
Show'rs on her *kings* barbaric pearl and gold."

e) Emerson, *Friendship*:

"Do churls
Know the worth of *Orient pearls*?
Give the gem which dims the moon
To the noblest or to none."

From the foregoing discussion, then, we may draw the following conclusions:

1. The opening stanza of the poem contains no mention whatever of the maiden Pearl. She is not contrasted with any other pearl, nor is there any allusion to her sepulchre, or her golden hair, or her place in heaven. In them Christ is not referred to, even by implication. Consequently, the bias that one and all translators, in a greater or less degree, have given to every reader's judgment concerning the elegiac and autobiographical elements in the poem, by making personal these important opening lines, is wholly unjustified.

2. On the contrary, the statements in these lines are only to be taken literally, without "secondary allusions" and "figurative meanings." They are best understood by comparison with similar ones in the lapidaries, then extremely popular in England, which have been neglected by translators and annotators in elucidating them. The great popularity of the pearl as an ornament of attire at the time, gave particular point to its emblematic use in the poem.

3. Finally, it is evident that, beginning themselves with the wrong impression that the girl Pearl is mentioned at the very start of the poem, critics not only have been led to seek out and emphasize unduly other possible personal references, but have lost sight of the author's artistic plan in the structure of his work.

But if we tear away the fictitious veil of personal reference which has been made to enshroud the opening of *The Pearl*, we see that every statement of the author is not only literally exact, but also calculated to arouse the interest of his readers, and to lay a foundation for the symbolism of the poem which he planned to develop; for,

from an actual treatment of the gem pearl, the poet leads us through various stages of symbolical presentation to the final symbol in the last line, in which, harking back intentionally to the first line, he prays that "we may *all* be pearls, unto the pleasure of the Prince of Heaven"—that is, that we may all come to have the spiritual qualities which in his verses he has represented the jewel as be-tokening, whereby we also may attain to the joys of paradise. Here is a well-ordered climax from the material to the spiritual, from the actual to the figurative, from the picturing of a representative individual to that of an all-embracing ideal.

"Qui Dieu aime et ses vertus croit
Les pierres doit amer par droit
Qui ce desdit dit com pechieres
Que Diex n'ait mis vertus em pierres."¹

Perhaps, furthermore, since we are considering the opening stanza, it may be well for us, before going farther, to contemplate the way in which a single word in it has been utilized to support a conjecture as to the poet's love-relations with some unknown woman. When Professor Gollancz translated the poem years ago he saw in the word "*privy*" of the last line ("*þat privy pearl withouten spot*") only the meaning "*mine own*." But recently, riveting his attention upon the word more closely, he has been fortunate enough to discover its occult significance, and has been led to offer this interesting suggestion: "*perhaps she [Pearl] was a love-child, hence his *privy* pearl*" (p. 331)!² Is Professor Gollancz serious in this remark? or is he merely

¹ *Lapidaire*, ll. 49 ff. (Pannier, p. 239).

² *Camb. Hist.*, I, 331.

making sport of his elaborate "hypothetical biography"? In a previous discussion,¹ on the contrary, he suggested that Pearl was perhaps the fruit of an unhappy marriage with a woman who "proved unfaithful" to the poet. Here is a disposition with a vengeance to drag in scandal in order to gratify our modern taste for personalities. If the unmentioned mother of Pearl, the Bride of the Lamb, was not the poet's unfaithful wife, she might have been his mistress! Take your choice. Never, however, forget "the great duel of sex." Do not be content with what is said in the poem. Remember Abelard and his like. Guess what *might have been*.

In any case, Professor Gollancz is sure not only that Pearl was the poet's *own* child, but also that she was his *only*² child. There is not the faintest gleam of obvious evidence on this point; but if one is only subtle enough, one can discover hidden meanings—even in the opening stanza—that make the situation perfectly "clear." How did Professor Gollancz happen to overlook the notable line at the end of the first octave, which "perhaps" sums up the whole situation in this regard:

"I sette hyr sengeley in synglere"?

This he translated: "I placed my pearl supreme," but Dr. Osgood, evidently more exactly, "her [it] I have set apart and alone." If the adjective "privy" in the same stanza indicates that Pearl was a *love-child*, surely "singly in uniqueness," "apart and alone" indicates that she was an *only* child. Moreover, the manuscript of the poem is unique!

¹ In the Introd. to his edition of the poem, p. xlvii.

² *Id.*, p. xlvi; *Camb. Hist.*, I, 331.

The following lines contribute all the evidence on this point that has hitherto been adduced:

• “‘O Perle,’ quod I, ‘in perlez py₃t,
‘Art þou my perle þat I haf playned,
Regretted by myn one on ny₃te’” ? (st. 21).

In his edition (p. xlviii), Professor Gollancz quoted the greater part of this “significant” passage, and remarked: “This is consistent with my theory concerning the poet’s married life”—*i. e.*, that his wife was unfaithful to him. Both times that Professor Gollancz quotes the passage he omits the words “on ny₃te,” and he translates differently those underlined: in his edition, “of me so *lone* regretted,” giving citations in a note (p. 114) to confirm the rendering of “one” as “lone(ly)”; in his article, “regretted by me *alone*.” As a matter of fact, the dreamer simply represents himself as mourning for his lost pearl when he is “alone at night”; but Professor Gollancz would have him state here that he “alone” (*i. e.*, only) mourned for the child, at night or at any other time. There was no other being in the world who cared a fig about her death. What conclusion could be more clear than that the poet had an unfaithful wife whom he would not mention, or a mistress whom he could not (at all events suitably) in a poem exalting above all else purity and holiness? And is it not also clear that since he mourned “alone at night” he could not have had another child?

It is important, in any case, to keep in mind the sort of evidence that has led Professor Gollancz to satisfy himself and to affirm as if there was no possibility of denial: “The personal side of the poem is *clearly* marked, though the author nowhere directly refers to his fatherhood.”¹

¹ *Camb. Hist.*, I, 321.

Dr. Osgood too has recently discovered something new, along different lines, in this opening stanza; namely, that in it "there sounds prophetically, but faintly, the note of peace and triumph which later brings the poem to its final cadence."¹ Considering what we have seen to be the meaning of the stanza, it is obvious that the "faintly" should, indeed, be emphasized—unless one's ears are attuned to sounds that ordinary mortals cannot hear.

II.

It is an obvious fact that symbolism is fundamental in the structure of *The Pearl*.

The poet begins by representing himself as having lost a pearl, that has slipped away from him into the grass. It is evident later, however, that this pearl he planned to be only the symbol of a little maiden, whom he represents as having died before she was two years of age, thereby to become a Bride of the Lamb in Heaven—in which position she is described at length by the poet, and a considerable body of argument and instruction put by him into her mouth.

The author does not compare the child to a pearl, as in a simile, but identifies her with one symbolically. Yet, it should be particularly noted that this identification does not appear, even by justifiable surmise of the uninstructed reader, before line 161, when for the first time a maiden is mentioned: up to then there is no indication whether the lost pearl (if one might conjecture it to be the symbol of some one departed, and probably some one of the female

¹ Introd. to translation, p. ix.

sex) was a sister, a niece, a cousin, a lady-love, a friend, or indeed an unequivocally allegorical figure—and not until line 241 is the identification of “the pearl, a girl” complete. Then, in a group of stanzas (21-26) each of which ends with the refrain, “I have been a joyless jeweller” (or words similar, of which “jeweller” is always the last) the poet plays around the symbol of the pearl, a girl in heaven. The dreamer asks the apparition he sees if she is his pearl which slipped away from him into the grass (245), leaving him a joyless jeweller ever since. Whereupon, “that jewel” rebukes him austere-ly for saying that his pearl is “all away” when it is “in a coffer so comely clent” (259), *i. e.*, in paradise, which is a treasure-chest (*forser*) that should please him if he were a gentle jeweller.

In the following words,¹ the poet shows a tendency to heap up symbols:²

¹ I follow in the main Professor Gollancz's translation as being more literal; but Dr. Mitchell's rendering, so far as it goes, seems to me the most poetic of all that have appeared.

² The season chosen for the vision to take place is plainly symbolical:

“In August in a high season,
When corn is cut with sharp sickles” (39-40).

The “high season” is probably that of the Assumption of the Virgin, the fifteenth. No doubt, as I wrote in my previous article (p. 189), the choice of time and the wording was intended to suggest the harvest of the Great Reaper, as described in St. John's vision of one “like unto the Son of Man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle,” who, at the bidding of an angel crying with a loud voice “the harvest of the earth is ripe,” “thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped.” We feel, as if our poet too, like the Apostle, may have heard a voice from heaven saying unto him: “Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth.”

- (a) " 'twas but a rose that thou didst lose,
that bloomed and withered, as nature bade;
through the casket's grace, that held it secure,
now 'tis proved a pearl of price"¹ (269 ff.).
- (b) "A jewel to me then was this guest,²
And jewels were her gentle words" (277-8).

There is also symbolism (let us hope) in stanza 3, where the gem that fell to the ground is represented as so enriching the earth as to make peculiarly beautiful flowers to grow there; and, further, as a "seemly seed" that could not fail to yield "springing spices." The poet calls the maiden a "lovely flower" (962) and twice a "special spice" (235, 938).

It should be observed that the symbolism of losing the jewel is preserved throughout the poem in such phrases as the following:

- (a) "Through grass to ground it went from me" (10).
(b) It "sprang" from him (13).
(c) "It drove down in dark mould" (30).
(d) It "trundled down" (41).
(e) "Where the pearl did fall" (411).
(f) It "strayed to ground" (1173).

¹ Of this passage Dr. Osgood says (p. 67): "The whole passage shows an imperfect identification of the symbol with its subject" (259-61); and yet he thinks that "no symbolic meaning is discernible" in the frequency of the epithet jeweler, though reminiscent of the same epithet in the parable of the pearl of great price (734).—Compare the epithets of "rose" and "margaret" applied to the Virgin in such a passage as the following from the close of Gower's *Mirour de l'Omme* (ed. Macaulay, I, 334):

"O rose sanz espine dite
Odour de balsme, o mirre (myrrh) eslite, . . .
Sur tutes belles la plus belle
O gemme, o fine Margarite."

See also below, p. 628.

² In speaking to or of the girl personally the dreamer calls her: "that jewel" (253; cf. 277), "that gem" (289; cf. 266), "that precious piece" (192, 229). Even Christ is a "dear jewel" (795).

In one place it is made personal with the same sort of phraseology:

(g) "Since into grass *thou* slipped away from me" (245).

Literalness is, of course, out of the question. A young girl does not slip through the hands of a mourner and trundle down into the grass, any more than a rose turns into a pearl (no matter what coffer or chest it is put in), or a dropped pearl becomes a "seemly seed" yielding "springing spices," or a maiden speaks pearls.

Practically, however, the main thought of the poem is summed up in the word "pearl"; and in a consideration of the gem's attributes there originated many sorts of symbolical suggestion.

It is of small moment that both the gem and the girl are repeatedly called "precious," or "merry," or "gentle," or even "smooth" and "small." It is of more importance that both are "clean," "pure" and "white"—"undefiled," "without spot," "immaculate." Herein lies the final and chief teaching of the work, that those who dwell with Christ in heavenly joy are "pearls," spotless in His sight.

In the description of the maiden's attire, pearls are represented as her almost exclusive adornment. She was "pight in pearls of royal price"; her clothing was adorned with the "merriest margerics" the dreamer had ever seen; her kirtle was "with precious pearls all bedight" (sts. 17-20). And the "whiteness" of the maiden, like that of the pearl, is in this connection especially emphasized ("Blysnande whyt watȝ hyr bleaunt"—163, repeated 197):

"Bedight and broidered was each hem—
at the sleeves, the sides, and each opening—
with white pearls, with none other gem,
And burnished white was all her array" (st. 19).

We read also of her appearance: "white as pure ivory was her face" (178), "whiter than whale-bone was her hue" (212). Cf. stanza 63.

Particularly symbolical are two features of her adornment: 1. the crown on her head; and 2. (above all) the great pearl on her breast.¹

1. "A crown that maiden wore withal
bedecked with pearls, with none other stones,
and pinnaced high with pure white pearls" (205 ff.).

"That clean gem" (289) wore a "crown of pearl orient" (255). She declares that by the Lord she was "crowned clean in virginity" (768).

2. "But a wondrous pearl without a flaw
amidmost her breast was firmly set,—
soul of man might grow full faint,
ere mind of man might measure its worth.
I trow no tongue might e'er avail
to speak of that sight a fitting word,
so all unspotted, and clear, and pure,
was that precious pearl, where it was dight" (st. 19).

This pearl is later identified with the pearl of price of Scripture parable:

"'This spotless pearl, so dearly bought,
for which the jeweller gave all his wealth,
is like to the realm of heaven bright,'
so said the Father of earth and sea,
'for it is flawless, clear, and clean,
round, without end, and winsome of cheer,
and common to all that righteous be.'
And lo, 'twas set amidmost my breast" (st. 61).

¹ Professor A. S. Cook, in his article "*Pearl*, 212 ff.," in *Modern Philology*, Oct., 1908, pp. 196-200, writes as follows in conclusion: "the flawless pearl—evidently symbolical in a peculiar degree—that constitutes the jewel at her breast."

In similar fashion the girl herself is called a "pearl of price" (272). And just as it is repeatedly said of the gem that it was "immaculate" (*mascellez*, 732, 733, 744, 756) so the same statement is made of the girl: "O immaculate pearl in pearls pure" (745; cf. 768), "immaculate bride" (769), "a matchless maiden and immaculate" (780; cf. 923).

" 'Immaculate,' quoth that merry queen,
 'unblemished I am, without blot' " (781-2).

The pearl that the poet first represents himself as losing, it is repeatedly said, was "without spot" (12, 24, 36, 48, 60). The pearl of price of the parable is likewise "spotless" (855). The girl herself is called a "clean gem" (289), "without gall" (198; 915), a "moteless (spotless) maiden" (961). Christ called her to Him "in His bonerté":

"Come hither to me, my lemman sweet,
 For mote or spot is none in thee" (763-4).

It is manifest that the qualities of the pearl of price in the parable are those of the pearl on her breast. In the qualities of that one wondrous pearl that the "jeweller" of old sold all to obtain, are summed up the peculiar qualities of the girl in paradise, whom the dreamer longed to regain: it and she were clean, clear, white, pure, spotless, immaculate.

As has already been observed, it is explicitly stated that Pearl, as she appears to the dreamer, is a Bride of the Lamb, "His immaculate Bride" (769), His "lemman sweet" (769). She, on her part, calls Christ:

"My Lamb, my Lord, my dear jewel,
 My joy, my bliss, my lemman free" (795-6).

and she thus describes her position:

“through His godhead my Lord the Lamb
took me in marriage unto Himself
crowned me queen to revel in bliss,
in length of days that ever shall last;
Yea, each beloved holdeth in fee
His heritage; I am wholly His;
His worth, His price, His peerless rank
are root and ground of all my bliss” (st. 35).

But it deserves emphasis that she was exactly like all the other Brides of the Lamb. She was in no way unique in appearance, vesture, position, or occupation. She was but one of the 144,000 whom the Lord had taken in marriage and crowned queens to dwell with Him forever.

“The Lamb’s wives in bliss we be
A hundred and forty¹ thousand, company” (785-6).

They form the “Lamb’s company” (893); all are “members of Jesus Christ” (458); “all in suit their livery was” (1108). The dreamer observes a procession in Sion

“of maidens all in that same guise,
as was my blest one ’neath her crown;
and crowned were all in self-same fashion,
arrayed in pearls and robes of white;
on each one’s breast was fastened firm
that winsome pearl of great delight” (st. 92).

In this radiant host (“meyny schene,” 1145) of followers of the Lamb, he saw his “little queen”:

“Lord! much of mirth was it she made!
Among her peers she was so white” (1149 ff.).

¹ Cf. 869-70: “an hundred thousand and *four* and forty thousand more.”

They together were "a comely pack of jolly (lovely) jewels."

It is next to be noted that Pearl and all her company have the appearance and qualities of the Lamb Himself.

"Best was He, blithest, and most to prize,
that e'er I heard described in speech;
so winsomely white was His array;
His looks simple, Himself so gentle" (1131 ff.).
"So were his glents (looks) glorious glad" (1144).

Of Pearl we read that she was "blithely linked with bliss" (385), "a maiden of menske (grace) full debonaire" (162) [Christ had called her "his bonerté," 762], "gentle" (602); "lovesome of form and face" (398), "sheen" (beautiful, 166, 965), "gracious gay without gall" (189); "burnished white was her vesture" (220)—she calls Christ "my dear jewel" (795; cf. "that gay jewel," 1124), even as she herself is repeatedly called a jewel. She calls Him "my lemman sweet" (829), "my lemman free (noble, 796; cf. 805), even as He said to her: "Come hither to me, my lemman sweet" (763). Above all, she was immaculate like her "immaculate Master" (900); she was "innocent" as her "glorious guiltless" Lord (799).

Further, not she alone but all the "meyny" that followed "the gentle Lamb" were "like to Himself in lote (look) and hue" (896). Of Christ it is said: "as praised pearls his weeds were" (1112); and the Brides of the Lamb were "depaynt (arrayed) in pearls and white weeds" (1102).

"This Lamb of Jerusalem had ne'er a spot
of other hue save winsome white,
stain nor blemish might ne'er touch
wool so white, so rich and rare;
wherefore every spotless soul
is for that Lamb a worthy bride" (st. 71).

The "seemly clot" (789) of Brides of the Lamb, the "meyny sheen" (1145) and "comely" (775), were a "flock without flake" (947), "clean without mote" (972), "without black spots" (945), "without filth, or gall, or glet" (1060), "spotless" (1068).

Thus our analysis shows that the symbolism of the poem centres in the fundamental conception of the pearl as "immaculate." Recalling that the pearl which the poet represents himself as losing is repeatedly said in the opening stanzas to be "without spot," we should now bear in mind that this quality is emphasized without ceasing by the poet, and applied to all the pearls mentioned by him and by all who bear them.¹ The adjective "immaculate" (*maskellez*) is applied to:

- (a) the pearl of great price.
- (b) the pearl on the maiden's breast and on that of all the Brides of the Lamb.
- (c) the maiden Pearl.
- (d) the 144,000 Brides of the Lamb.
- (e) the Lamb Himself—the Master.

And, finally, it would seem, the hope is extended to the dreamer, and through him to every one, that he may obtain an "immaculate pearl." The maiden instructs the dreamer that the pearl on her breast is "common to all that righteous were," and counsels him: "forsake the mad world and purchase *thy* pearl immaculate" (744-5). She has already counselled him (st. 34) to be "deep devout in all meekness" if he wishes to appear in the abode of her Lord the Lamb, for "He loves aye such cheer." And

¹ Dr. Osgood notes in his glossary (p. 149) of the word *juel*: "used figuratively of the Pearl, 249, 253, 277; of her words, 278; of her companions, 929; of Christ, 795, 1124."

the final fruit of his vision and her instruction is his prayer: "May He grant us to be servants of His house and precious pearls to His delight." The "jeweller" (that is, the dreamer) of the opening lines of the poem discovers that he must be like the "jeweller" of the parable, forsake everything esteemed of worth in this world, to obtain the "pearl of price" and enjoy the life of the blessed—and to do this, he must be like a pearl, like a child, like Christ. The gem pearl in general, the pearl in the parable, the pearl on the breast of the maiden and her companion Brides of the Lamb, the maiden herself, the other Brides, and the Prince of Heaven were all pure and undefiled. So must all be who aspire to see Him in His glory. "Every soul that had no spot is worthy to be a Bride of the Lamb" (845-6).

Similarly, in another work by our poet, the idea of "cleanness" ¹ is strongly emphasized:

"On spec of a spote may spede to mysse,
Of þe syȝte of þe souerayn þat sytteȝ so hyȝe,
For þat schewe me schale in þo schyre howseȝ.
As þe beryl bornyst byhoueȝ be clene,
þat is soude on vche a syde & no sem habes,
With-outen maskle oper mote² as margerye perle" (551 ff.).
Clerrer counseyl, counseyl con I non, bot þat þou clene worþe.
For Clopyngnel in þe compas of his clene Rose,
þer he expouneȝ a speche,³ to hym þat spede wolde,
Of a lady to be loued, loke to hir sone,
Of wich beryng þat ho be, & wych ho best louyes,

¹ In the familiar Biblical use of the word: "Create in me a clean heart," etc. (Psalms, LI).

² Cf. *Pearl*, 725-6:

"Harmleȝ, trwe and vndefylde,
Wythouten mote oper mascle of sulpande synne."

³ Cf. *Pearl*, 36: "þat spot þat I in speche expoun."

& be ryȝt such in vch a borȝe of body & of dedes,
 & folȝ þe fet of þat fere þat þou fre haldes.
 & if þou wyrkkes on þis wyse, þaȝ ho wyk were,
 Hir schal lyke þat layk þat lyknes hir tulle.
 If þou wyl dele drwrye wyth dryȝtyn þenne,
 & lelly louy þy lorde & his leef worþe,
 þenne confourme þe to krysst, & þe clene make,
 þat euer is polyced als playn as þe perle seluen.
 For loke fro fyrst þat he lyȝt with-inne þe lel mayden!
 By how comely a kest he watȝ clos þere,
 When venkkyst watȝ no vergynyte, ne vyolence maked,
 But much clener watȝ hir corse, God kynned þerinne,

How schulde we se, þen may we say, þat syre vpon throne?
 ȝis, þat mayster is mercyable; þoȝ þou be man fenny,
 & al to-marred in myre whyl þou on molde lyuyes,
 þou may schyne þurȝ schryfte, þaȝ þou haf schome serued,
 & pure þe with penaunce tyl þou a perle worþe (1056 ff.).¹

In the long passage above, the author draws an interesting illustration of his thought from the *Roman de la Rose*:² there (he says) one might learn that, to obtain a lady's love one must study to do as she desires—similarly to obtain the love of the Lord, one must strive to conform to Him and make oneself "clean," purify oneself till one becomes a pearl.

The poet also dwells at length upon the "clean" Virgin and her Son; "for non so clene of such a clos com neuer er þenne" (1088). And emphasis is laid on Christ's "courtesy": "Alle called on þat cortayse & claymed his grace" (1097). This is parallel to the fine section (sts. 36 ff.) in *The Pearl*, in which we read of the Virgin "of whom sprang grace, who bore a child of virgin flower" (425-6):

" 'Courteous queen,' then said that gay,
 kneeling to earth, with covered face,
 'Matchless mother and merriest maid,

¹ Cf. *Cleanness*, ll. 12, 17 ff., 27 ff., 161 ff., 195 ff.

² Further on this work, see p. 637, n.

Blessed beginner of every grace.'

'That empress in her empire (*bayly*) hath
all the heavens and earth and hell,
from their heritage none would she chase,
for she is queen of courtesy'" (st. 37).

Like the pearl which the poet put "sengeley in synglere" (8), and which was peculiar among gems because always found alone, the Virgin is said to be unique "for *synglerty* of her *dousour*" (sweetness), so that she was called "the Phoenix of Araby,¹ the bird immaculate of form" (430 ff.).

There is no distinction, it is emphasized, except in degree, between Pearl's condition and that of the Virgin in heaven. What is said of both is similar to what we find written of Our Lady in the various hymns, Ave Marias, Fifteen Joys, etc., which were so abundant in the fourteenth century, the product of devout zeal and mystic contemplation.²

In a longer allegorical poem, the *Castle of Love*,³ (*Château d'Amour*), attributed to Grosseteste, much in substance and phraseology is strikingly similar to what is

¹ Dr. Osgood (p. xxi; cf. 72 f.) lays too much weight on the similarity of this passage to Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess*, where Blanche is compared to "the soleyne fenix of Arabye, for ther liveth never but oon" (982-3). He appears to have overlooked my reference (article, p. 190, n. 3) to the remark of "Mandevile" (whose book our author certainly knew) "of the bird Fenix of Arabye"; "Et puet homme comparer cel oisel a Dieu, en ceo qe ni ad forsqe vn soul" (p. 25). There is no clear evidence that our author knew Chaucer, though the probability, of course, is that he did.

² At this time there was a great dispute about the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin.

³ Ed. J. O. Halliwell, 1849, pp. 77 ff.; M. Cooke, Caxton Soc., 1852; Weymouth, Phil. Soc., 1864.

said of the Virgin in *The Pearl* as just quoted, and of Pearl, the Bride of the Lamb. The Castle of Love is the body of the sweet, matchless maiden Mary. It had three "baillies" (809 ff): the inmost betokened her "holy maidenhood," the middle one her "holy chastity," and the outmost her "holy espousal." All of these our author too dwells upon. The poem closes with an ecstatic picture of the joys of heaven, in the company of the Prince of Peace, whose face the righteous shall see:

"And he may see the dearworth queen,
God's mother so bright and sheen,
The sweet maid, Saint Mary,
And all the fair company
They will make him joy with their might,
The apostles and the martyrs
The confessors and the virgins,

.
In which joys God of His high grace
In Heaven give *you* all a place."

As everyone no doubt has noticed, the author of *The Pearl* has peopled paradise with none but maidens. He mentions no apostles, no martyrs or confessors, but only virgins. Yet he holds out the hope that we may all gain the rewards of Heaven—and that by no merits of our own, but only "of His high grace."

St. Aldhelm in his *De Laudibus Virginitatis* (written A. D. 706) called maidens "Margaritæ Christi, paradisi gemmæ."¹ Repeatedly the Virgin is saluted as a pearl, a rose,² etc. In a *Coventry Shepherd's Play*³ (v, 3), the words of the first Pastor are:

¹ See my previous article, p. 166.

² See Dreves, *Analecta Hymnica*, Leip., 1886 ff., *passim*; cf. Warton-Hazlitt, II, 284.

³ See *Eng. Nativity Plays*, ed. S. B. Hemingway (Yale Studies in Eng., xxxviii), N. Y., 1909, p. 116.

"Hail, flower of flowers! fairest i-found!
Hail, pearl of pearls, prime rose of price"!

Dunbar, in his *Ballad of Our Lady*,¹ refers to the Virgin under many similitudes, most of which were traditional:

"Rose Mary, most of virtue virginal,
Fresh flower on whom the heavenly dew down fell;
O gem, joined with joy angelical.
In whom Jesus rejoiced for to dwell.
Root of truth, of mercy springing well,²
Of ladies chief, as is of letters A,
Empress of heaven, paradise, and hell,
O Mater Jesu salve Maria! (st. 1).

"Hail! purified Pearl, hail! Porte of Paradise,³
Hail! redolent Ruby, both rich and radious,
Hail! clarified crystal, hail! Queen, hail Empress!
Hail! mother of God, hail! Virgin glorious,
Hail! gratia plena, tecum Dominus,
Hail! Gabriel greeting with "Ave gratia,
Benedicta tu in Mulieribus."
O Mater Jesu, salve Maria!" (st. 6).

In this poem she is also called "Virgins' Queen," "angels' observance," "God's own chief delight," "Christ's love," "sweet maid," "meek maiden," "mild mother," etc.—likewise:

"O clear conclave of clean Virginitie!
That closed Christ, without crimes criminal" (st. 2).

We remember that Pearl was "crowned clean in Vir-

¹ Cf. H. N. MacCracken, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXIV (1909), pp. 110 ff. —Eng. version by Forrest. Cf. passage from Gower, cited p. 617, note, above.

² Cf. *Pearl*, 436: "Blessed beginner of every grace."

³ In *Pearl* (1037-8) it is stated that each gate of Paradise was "a perfect pearl that never fades."

ginity." It is not hard to find the sort of reading our poet had done, and what was in his thought when he described the pearls of paradise.

Naturally enough, under the circumstances, he reverted also to the description of St. Margaret, whose virginity, chastity and espousal to Christ are emphasized in the hymns and sequences sung in her honor.¹ There is no reference in our poem to the *life* of St. Margaret; but consideration of her position as a virgin in the hereafter was wholly in accord with the author's thought. I am glad to reproduce here the passage from the prologue to the life of St. Margaret in the *Legenda Aurea*² which Dr. Osgood quotes: "Margareta dicitur a quadam pretiosa gemma, quae margarita vocatur; quae gemma est candida, parva, et virtuosa. Sic beata Margareta fuit candida per virginitatem, parva par humilitatem, virtuosa per miraculorum operationem. Virtus autem hujus lapidis dicitur esse contra effusionem, contra cordis passionem et ad spiritus confortationem." Here the name of the saint is brought into connection with that of the gem, the physical qualities of which are interpreted emblematically. The gem is "candida"; St. Margaret was a virgin. The gem is "parva"; St. Margaret was humble. The gem is "virtuosa" (referring to its medicinal qualities); St. Margaret performed miracles. This resembles the method of our poet. To him, as we have seen, the most striking physical quality of the pearl was that it was "spotless," "immaculate." Therefore, purity is first and foremost

¹ See Dreves, *Analecta Hymnica*, s. v. Margaretha, *passim*; Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen*, III, 403-13, etc.

² Ed. Graesse, 1846, cap. 93 (88), pp. 400 ff.; cf. Osgood, *Pearl*, p. xxxii: "Three of the eight English lives of St. Margaret paraphrase this prologue, namely, those by Lydgate, a pseudo-Barbour, and Bokenam."

the theme of *The Pearl*. But the gem was also "small," and the poet pictures his pearl as a child and emphasizes also humility, meekness, and resignation to the divine will. By virtue of the spiritual qualities which the gem symbolized, Pearl became a Bride of the Lamb—so the poet prays that we may all be pearls, that we may see the Lord face to face in Sion.

Dr. Osgood, who alone has undertaken seriously to refute my arguments for symbolism and allegory in *The Pearl*, admits (p. xxv) that there are "certain allegorical [*i. e.*, symbolical] elements" in the poem, which he defines as follows:

"First and most obvious is the figure of the pearl lost in the grass, which, however, rapidly fades into a more literal manner of speaking, and, *except for occasional epithets*,¹ has quite disappeared within the first three hundred lines. Secondly, once having associated the maiden with the gem through their common name, it is natural that even a poet who had no preference for allegory should come to feel some correspondence between the qualities of both which would impart, now and then, a certain allegorical cast to his work. Thus the pearl, which is used so lavishly in the poem as an embellishment, gathers a kind of latent symbolism from the qualities of her for whom it stands and with whom it is associated, and for the time being becomes a shining emblem of her virtues. But any such emblematic result was perhaps reached unconsciously, or at any rate did not constitute an important part of the poet's original design."

¹ It is important to note the passage which I have italicized. As a matter of fact, through these "occasional epithets," the symbolism of the pearl a girl *never* disappears from the poem; see above p. 617 ff.

Now Dr. Osgood's erudition is great, and he is well acquainted with mediæval literature. His edition of *The Pearl* is most scholarly. Yet one cannot but quarrel with the personal conclusions he draws from the facts before him. I pass by now the assumption which he makes, like others before him,¹ in complete contempt of evidence, that the heavenly maiden Pearl bore *on earth* the name Margaret, or, as Dr. Osgood learnedly argues,² "more likely Margery." What I believe Dr. Osgood should have recognized, after the thorough study he made of the poem, is this—that the "allegorical cast" (*i. e.*, the symbolism) of the poem does not appear "now and then" but pervasively, wherever it could appear, from beginning to end of the work. We may safely assert that it is not in the least "a kind of *latent* symbolism," and by no possibility could this "emblematic result" have been reached "unconsciously." How, in any case, can Dr. Osgood know that it "did not constitute an important part of the poet's original design"? Certainly, it seems to be absolutely fundamental. Take this away and the structure of the poem falls to pieces. On the other hand, take away the would-be "personal references" and their absence is hardly noticeable. We are content to leave the reader to decide whether he can agree with Dr. Osgood, who states (p. xxxiv) that the poet "rather tends to avoid symbolism, even when it lies in his way"!

¹ Usually first introducing it with a "perhaps," or "probably," which is soon, however, lost sight of.

² P. xxii; cf. xxxiii. On this point, see below, p. 652 f.

III.

We now pass to allegory proper, which strictly should be separated from symbolism.

Was the pearl ever interpreted allegorically? To this question, the answer is: Yes, almost countless times. The allegorization naturally appears primarily in connection with "the pearl of great price" of Scripture parable (Matthew, XIII, 45, 46)—which, it is important to remember, was present in the poet's thought, as is plain from the following stanzas (61-62):

" ' Jesu called his meek disciples;
 He said no wight might win His realm,
 Save he come there as a child;
 else might he never come therein;
 but the harmless, the undefiled, and the true,
 with ne'er stain nor spot of sapping sin,
 when they come knocking at that place,
 quickly the gate shall be opened for them.
 There is the bliss that cannot fade,
 that the jeweller sought among all earth's gems,
 and sold his all, both linen and wool,
 to purchase a spotless pearl.

" ' This spotless pearl, so dearly bought,
 for which the jeweller gave all his wealth,
 is like to the realm of heaven bright,'
 so said the Father of earth and sea,
 ' for it is flawless, clear, and clean,
 round, without end, and winsome of cheer,
 and common to all that righteous be.'
 And lo, 'twas set amidmost my breast.
 My Lord the Lamb that shed His blood,
 He set it there in token of peace.
 I rede thee to leave the world so mad,
 and purchase thy¹ spotless pearl."

¹ Gollancz reads "this"; see however, Osgood's edition.

It will be noticed first that this pearl of great price is identified with the pearl on the maiden's breast, and said to have been put there by the Lord "in token of peace."¹ It indicates, further, "the bliss that cannot fade" and it "is like the realm of heaven bright"; it is "common to all that righteous were"—the reward of the faithful in heaven. Here is conscious allegory. The author gives deliberate assent to the method of the Church Fathers in allegorizing the plain statements of the Scripture text. He does not, to be sure, give all the allegorical interpretations of the passage.² Why should he? He had clearly an embarrassment of choice, and perhaps gave more than was really wise; for Dr. Osgood and other critics find the interpretation "somewhat confused."

On this passage Dr. Osgood has a learned and illuminating note which I should like to quote entire:

"The poet's interpretation . . . may have been prompted chiefly by Albertus, *Compendium Theolog. Veritatis*, 2. 4, *Opera*, ed. Borgnet, 34. 42: 'Coelum est corpus purum . . . essentia subtilissimum, incorruptibilitate solidissimum, . . . quietate perspicuum, . . . materia purissimum, figura sphæricum . . . Beatorum spiritum habitaculum.' Yet it seems to reflect faintly some of the mediæval comments on this passage in Matthew. Augustine says the pearl represents Christ, or the love of one's neighbor, or the supreme knowledge of the Word, which resembles a pearl in being 'purus et solidus et nusquam a se dissonans' (cf. l. 738); or finally it signifies ourselves, whom we reclaim by giving all things else in exchange (*Quæst. 17 in Matt.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 35. 1371). In Jerome (*Comm. in Matt.*, 2, 13. 45, *Patr. Lat.*, 27. 98) it is knowledge of the Saviour, the sacrament of his passion, and the mystery

¹ Cf. also *Pearl*, 951-2 where "Jerusalem" is said to mean "nothing else but City of God, or Sight of Peace."

² My colleague, Professor Josiah Royce, has recently written (*Philosophy of Loyalty*, 1908, p. 157): "Let loyalty be your pearl of great price." In the *Assembly of Ladies*, Loyalty was adorned "with grete perles ful fine and orient." See below, p. 659 f.

of the resurrection. In Gregory it is the sweetness of the heavenly kingdom (*Hom. in Evangelia*, 11. 2). Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Catena Aurea*, tr. 1874, 2. 513. See Introd. p. xxxi. For their bearing upon this passage in the Introduction I add the following interpretations of the pearl: Christ, or the preaching of the Gospel, Chrysostom, *Hom.*, 23, on Matt. 7. 6 and *Hom.*, 4. 7, on Matt., 13. 45; the eternal life, Petrus Chrysologus, *Patr. Lat.*, 184, 1069; the Virgin (as frequently), Bernard, *Patr. Lat.*, 184, 1069; in a homily attributed to him (*Patr. Lat.*, 184, 1131) it is 'religio sancta, pura, et immaculata'; in Rupert of Deutz (*Patr. Lat.*, 169. 1202) the pearls of the heavenly gates (Rev. 21. 21) are the saints adorning the Church; Hugo of St. Victor (*Patr. Lat.*, 176. 1159) says each gate is one pearl, 'quoniam per unitatem fidei et puritatem' the just enter heaven; at 1163, citing Matt., 13. 46 and Gregory, he says, 'Margarita vero mystice significat evangelicam doctrinam seu dulcedudinem cœlestis vitæ'; Albertus Magnus says it typifies those who enter into faith in the whiteness of all virtues, or are distinguished by one, 'ut Abraham a fide, Lot ab hospitalitate,' etc. (*Comm. in Apoc.*, 21. 21, ed. Borgnet, 38. 778); Bonaventura says the pearl is the crown of every saint in heaven (cited 1186 n.). In Gregory of Nazianzen the Trinity is a pearl (*Patr. Græc.*, 36. 304); Ephrem the Syrian perceives in the pearl 'mysteries pertaining to the kingdom—in its brightness, Christ; in its pureness, his body; in its undividedness, the Truth' (*Select Works*, ed. Morris, p. 84; cf. Albert S. Cook, *Mod. Lang Notes*, 20. 118); again Ephrem, in a hymn on the death of children (*Select Hymns and Homilies*, tr. H. Burgess, p. 14), says: 'Like pearls in diadems children are inserted in the kingdom.' Cf. 2 n., and 1211 and n. From this list may be found in general the sources of the interpretations in Usk's *Testament of Love*, viz., the church visible (2. 12); or, as a woman's name (Margaret), the pearl signifies grace, learning, or wisdom concerning God. This treatise is, of course, later than our poem" (pp. 82-83).

This valuable list might be considerably enlarged. According to Migne's Index (219, p. 266) no less than twenty-three Church Fathers deal with the parable of the pearl of price and its significance. For example, Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz (c. 850), in his *Allegoriae in Sacram Scripturam*¹ and elsewhere indicates many

¹ Migne, cxii, p. 996: "*Margarita est coeleste desiderium ut in*

interpretations of the pearl. As is noted in *The Book of the Pearl* (p. 304), Rabanus says that "mystically, the pearl signifies the hope of the kingdom of heaven, or charity, and the sweetness of the celestial life. True, it was not among the twelve gems which adorned the breast-plate of the high priest of the Temple, symbolical of the twelve apostles. A Father of the Church—St. Augustine, we believe—explains this by saying that it was reserved for a more sacred office, that of representing Christ himself."

It does not need argument, then, to show that the pearl has been allegorized scores of times in scores of different ways. The amazing thing is, how much of the thought of the Church Fathers has been distilled in the poem before us. The pearl, for example, in the allegories of the Fathers represents 1. Christ; 2. the Virgin; 3. the saints; 4. those who enter into faith in the whiteness of all virtues, or are distinguished by one; 5. supreme knowledge of the Word; 6. the resurrection; 7. the eternal life; 8. the crown of every saint in heaven; 9. mysteries pertaining to the kingdom; 10. wisdom concerning God; 11. gospel teaching; 12. sweetness of the celestial life; 13. love of one's neighbor; 14. purity; 15. grace; 16. truth; 17. "religio sancta, pura et immaculata"; 18. "ourselves, whom we reclaim by giving all else in exchange,"

Evangelio: 'Inventa una pretiosa margarita,' id est, concepto in mente desiderio coelesti. Per *margaritas* spiritualia sacramenta, ut in Evangelio: 'ne mittatis margaritas vestras ante porcos,' id est, interna mysteria non committatis immundis. Per *margaritas* homines justī, ut in Apocalypsi: 'Duodecim margaritae, duodecim portae,' quod homines sancti per fidem apostolorum aditum habent ad regnum coeleste. Per *margaritas* deliciae terrenae, ut in Apocalypsi: 'Mulier erat ornata margaritis,' quod fallacia hujus saeculi terrenis deliciis nitet."

etc. Any reader of *The Pearl* will recognize how much this manner of thought is present in the poem.¹ Even in places where the memory does not at once suggest the similarity, it will be seen to appear, as *e. g.*, in no. 5. "supreme knowledge of the Word." This interpretation by St. Augustine is due to the fact that it resembles the pearl because it is "*purus et solidus et nusquam a se*

¹ The thought of the author is like that of St. Bernard, who, for example, writes in a sermon just before one on the Assumption (*De diversis sermo*, XXXVII): "*Quis enim coelibem vitam vitam coelestem et angelicam dicere vereatur? Aut quod in resurrectione futuri sunt omnes electi, quomodo non jam nunc estis sicut angeli dei in coelo a nuptiis penitus abstinentes? Amplectimini, fratres, pretiosissimam margaritam, amplectimini sanctimonium vitae, qui vos efficit sanctorum similes et domesticos dei, dicente scriptura: Incorruptio facit proximum deo. Ita ergo non vestro quidem merito sed gratia dei estis, quod estis: quod ad castitatem et sanctimoniam spectat, angeli quidem terreni aut [potius] coeli cives sed interim in terra peregrini; quam diu enim sumus in [hoc] corpore, peregrinamur [a domino].*" There is a literal translation in Old French, *e. g.*,: "*Frere, teniz chiere ceste preciose mergerie, estranniz vos a sainte vie, car ille vos fait semblanz as sains et as amins de deu,*" etc. (Alfred Schulze, *Predigten des H. Bernhard in altfranz. Uebersetzung*, Tübingen, 1894, p. 333).

Compare, for example, the following passages in *The Pearl*:

- (a) "For meek are all that dwell near Him" (404).
- (b) "May he grant us to be His 'homely hyne'"
(servants of His house, "*domesticos Dei*") (1211-2).
- (c) "I rede thee, forsake the mad world
and purchase thy pearl immaculate" (743-4).
- (d) "But knowest thou mortal anywhere,
be he ever so holy in his prayers,
that hath ne'er forfeited in somewise
the meed of heaven so bright?
And aye more often, the older they grow,
have thy left the right and have wrought amiss;
mercy and grace must pilot them;
the grace of God is great enough" (st. 52).

dissonans," with which compare what is said in stanza 62 of the poem, as quoted above (p. 632).¹

¹ Our author was likewise familiar with secular allegories. In my previous article (pp. 182 ff.), I pointed out how much he was indebted to the *Roman de la Rose*, one of the very few works to which he refers directly in any of his poems. Professor Gollancz has since written (*Camb. Hist.*, I, 321): "While the main part of the poem is a paraphrase of the closing chapters of the Apocalypse and the parable of the vineyard, the poet's debt to *The Romaunt [of the Rose]* is noteworthy, more particularly in the description of the wonderful land through which the dreamer wanders; and it can be traced here and there throughout the poem, in the personification of Pearl as Reason, in the form of the colloquy, in the details of dress and ornament, in many a characteristic word, phrase and reference; 'the river from the throne,' in the Apocalypse, here meets 'the waters of the wells' devised by Sir Mirth for the garden of the Rose. From these two sources, *The Book of Revelation*, with its almost romantic glamour, and *The Romaunt of the Rose*, with its almost oriental allegory, are derived much of the wealth and brilliancy of the poem. The poet's fancy revels in the richness of the heavenly and the earthly paradise; but his fancy is subordinated to his earnestness and intensity."

Even Dr. Osgood admits (p. xiv) that our author employed "the style and machinery" of the *Roman* and that he was familiar with and felt "a certain comradeship in his art" with "the many fourteenth century imitators of the *Roman*"—such as Baudouin de Condé and his son Jean, Watriquet de Couvin, Guillaume de Machault, Froissart, Deschamps, Langland, and Chaucer. He remarks, however (p. xvi): "Not one of the personifications of abstract qualities, whose speeches constitute by far the chief part of the *Roman* and its kind, is distinctly present in *The Pearl*." Why, we may ask, should they be "distinctly present"? The poet did not plan for them to appear and speak. Yet note that the dreamer was pierced by *Love-Danger* (l. 11; cf. 250); *Reason* tried to make peace in his heart (52); *Kind of Christ* shewed him comfort (55; cf. *Kind* in Langland); and he reflects on *Fortune* (129; cf. Boethius, Bk. II). Note also st. 63:

"Thy beauty ne'er from Nature came;
Pygmalion painted ne'er thy face;
Nor Aristotle, with all his lore,
Ne'er told of the properties of thy kind."

Had the poet any allegorical idea in his mind above all others? Arguing from the likeness of the poem in theme and phraseology to various mediæval English works (*Clean Maidenhood*, *Love-Rune*, *Holy Maidenhood*, *Life of St. Margaret*, etc.), I suggested in my previous article (pp. 169 ff.) that, while Pearl was protean in symbolism, she was above all the emblem of Clean Maidenhood. I can only refer the reader to that article for the full illustration of that hypothesis. I confess that I am not now so much concerned to establish any particular allegorical teaching dominating the poem, as to obtain recognition of the fact that many sorts of allegorical suggestion are present in it, that the Pearl is a representative of the Brides of the Lamb, a representative of "the sweetness of the celestial life." The author pictured her life in paradise in the hope of making clear what is the real pearl of price which we should all seek. But, nevertheless, he mentions no others than virgins in Heaven, and "clean maidenhood" is to him an absorbing theme. Let scholars agree or not with my hypothesis about Pearl as primarily an emblem of chastity, they should not therefore deny the interweaving of allegory in the poem—such mystical allegory as was sanctioned and set forth by Christian writers during centuries previous to our poet's time, and was held worthy of acceptance then; for to do so is to misapprehend the purpose, plan, and potency of the work.

On the other hand, I regard as too purely subjective to be worth while such efforts at individualistic interpretations of the poem as the following by Dr. Osgood:

"Lastly, *The Pearl* may be considered allegorical somewhat as Dante's pilgrimage or *Sartor Resartus* is, in certain aspects, allegorical. Under the concrete and at least partly imaginary form of the dream lies a serious, almost prosaic, experience, familiar to all men of high spiritual aspiration. In early or middle life they often

seem to themselves to have achieved real wisdom, and to have laid hold upon the truth. But a sudden shift of fortune, or stroke of grief, destroys both faith and creed. Then comes the bitter and violent reaction, succeeded by indifferentism; but by slow degrees the ugly visitation becomes transformed and idealized, until it is the means of entering a new life of true wisdom and peace."

My desire has not been to read new possible meanings into the poem, in sympathy with our modern individualism, but simply to bring the light of mediæval conceptions to bear upon and elucidate the thought of a poem which is distinctly a product of its time.

Dr. Osgood contends (p. xxxiv) that because the poet does not *say* that his poem was allegorical, it could not have been; yet, as we have seen, he undertakes himself to define certain "allegorical elements" and invents new ones, which the poet failed even to "hint at."

He contends further that "virginity is only one of many interpretations of the pearl, and that it could never have been assumed by the poet to be the obvious, traditional one" (p. xxxi f). I agree entirely that there were many interpretations of the pearl. Indeed, I go farther and say that a learned man of the fourteenth century was so used to interpretations of the pearl that the word could hardly be mentioned without a great many rising to his memory instantly. And anyone then who wrote or read a poem entitled *The Pearl* would *expect* the treatment to be allegorical. He would not, however, expect the author of a *poem* to include a list of all previous or possible interpretations of the word, but only such as the poet chose to emphasize at that particular time for a particular purpose. Only a dull writer would need, or desire, to accompany his poem with a "key" to its meaning. It strikes one as ludicrous to have the author of the *Dispute between*

*Mary and the Cross*¹ explain at the end of his poem that the situation he presented was only the "fantasy of a clerk," that, as a matter of fact, no wooden cross ever spoke. It would have been easy to make an assertion that the cross spoke, which the credulous might readily have accepted, as any one who reads the legends of the Holy Rood then current is aware.²

Richard de Bury gives us a good example of multiple allegory in the first chapter of his *Philobiblon* (written c. 1345):

"O Books, who alone are liberal and free, who give to all who ask of you and enfranchise all who serve you faithfully! by how many thousand types are ye commended to learned men in the Scriptures given us by inspiration of God! For ye are the minds of profoundest wisdom, to which the wise man sends his son that he may dig out treasures: Prov. II. Ye are the wells of living waters, which father Abraham first digged, Isaac digged again, and which the Philistines strive to fill up: Gen. XXVI. Ye are indeed the most delightful ears of corn, full of grain, to be rubbed only by apostolic hands, that the sweetest food may be produced for hungry souls: Matt. XII. Ye are the golden pots in which manna is stored, and rocks flowing with honey, nay, combs of honey, most plenteous udders of the milk of life, garners ever full; ye are the tree of life and the fourfold river of Paradise, by which the human mind is nourished, and the thirsty intellect is watered and refreshed. Ye are the ark of Noah and the ladder of Jacob, and the troughs by which the young of those who look therein are coloured; ye are the stones of testimony and the pitchers holding the lamps of Gideon, the scrip of David, from which the smoothest stones are taken for the slaying of Goliath. Ye are the golden vessels of the temple, the arms of the soldiers of the Church with which to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked, fruitful olives, wines of Engadi, fig-trees that are never barren, burning lamps always to be held in readiness—and all the noblest comparisons of Scripture may be applied to books, if we choose to speak in figures."

¹ EETS., I.

² Cf. EETS., 46.

Here, to be sure, are only a score of "noble comparisons" by way of example from the Scriptures—not the "many thousand" that the author declares he might have given. But they are surely enough to show the disposition to manifold and accumulated allegory on the part of a fourteenth-century Englishman acquainted with Scripture if he "chose to speak in figures." "Figures of the truth" is the happy phrase the Psalmist applied to this sort of writing. Fourteenth-century Christian writers were exceedingly prone to present "figures of the truth," and before them the "pearl of great price" had been numberless times interpreted allegorically. A pedant then might have collected many of these as I recently have done myself. Fortunately, the author of *The Pearl* was no pedant. It is a marvel how skilfully he adheres to a single conception. He does not attempt to give all the possible, or all the traditional, interpretations of the "figure" of the pearl, but only such as centred on the thought that was uppermost in his mind. Let us be grateful for the poet's power of artistic elimination and concentration. Let us be grateful that he did not feel the necessity of exploiting his erudition.

Mr. Coulton thinks it past belief that I could persuade myself that the subject of *The Pearl* is "merely an abstract virtue which never existed in the flesh." "Just think," he says, "of an abstract virtue as lost through her own death and decay." If the Pearl were "simply maidenhood, how could the author's lost maidenhood (!) now be safe in heaven." It is hard to be patient with this sort of criticism, and it does not need a reply.

One cannot but wonder, however, what Mr. Coulton thinks of the *Romance of the Rose*. There is the figure of a beautiful maiden, Rose, who is described with life-like

detail; but she is a mere symbol. Now, imagine a lover wanting to kiss a symbol! And think of a lady being surrounded by allegorical abstractions which keep her lover from his desires. Treat the Rose as allegorical, and Mr. Coulton must needs tell you, if he is consistent, that you are talking "sheer nonsense." Well, nobody can *prove* that Guillaume de Lorris did not actually love a girl name Rose and struggle to possess her. Yet, after all, we have perhaps been well-advised in ignoring the possibility, and concentrating our attention on the fact that Guillaume undertook to write an allegory of love in general, and a didactic treatise on the Art of Love, an *Ars Amandi*.¹

Thomas de Hales, in his *Love-Rune*, a poem similar in many features to *The Pearl*, writes to a young lady of the abstract virtue "maidenhood" as a gem surpassing many others (actual gems, which he names) that would keep her "sweeter than any spice," if she guarded it "under her hem," and would bring her "into the bliss of paradise," while this very gem was shining bright "in the bower of heaven." The author of the fourteenth-century poem *Clean Maidenhood* says that if any girl should set the abstract virtue "maidenhood" in "a sweet love-ring" she would shine forever as bright as the sun; also, that the Lord loved "maidenhood" to "dwell near Him." The author of the homily *Holy Maidenhood* says that "Zion, the high tower of Jerusalem . . . betokeneth maidenhood" while remarking at the same time that "maidenhood is queen of heaven." Such facts as these it is well to bear in mind when questioning the reasonableness of the mediæval poem before us.

There is evidently nothing in the least surprising in the fact that symbolism and allegory are omnipresent in *The*

¹ See E. Langlois, *Origines et Sources du R. de la R.*, Paris, 1891.

Pearl. The surprising thing would be if they were not there. My readers may have balked at putting a single definite name, Maidenhood, Virginity, or Chastity, to that of which Pearl is the emblem. I would not urge the matter; for names are not of much significance in a case like this. Any reader may determine for himself which, if any, particular "figure of the truth" dominated the author's thought. But surely he cannot have such obscure vision as not to see any "figures" in the poem.

In the *Legend of Good Women* Chaucer wrote of the flower Marguerite:

"Hele and honour
To trouthe of womanhede and to this flour
That berth our alder pris in figuringe" (298 ff.).

Professor Macaulay has recently pointed out¹ quite rightly that the expression "in figuringe" in the last line is equivalent to "in figure." The line means: "That displays the glory of us all in a figure or emblem." "It is not that the daisy surpasses all women in external beauty, but it is an emblem of their spiritual graces, of purity and of truth."

"Unlike other gems, the pearl comes to us perfect and beautiful, direct from the hand of nature. Other precious stones receive careful treatment from the lapidary, and owe much to his art. The pearl, however, owes nothing to man. Perhaps this has much to do with the sentiments we cherish for it. It touches us with the same sense of simplicity and sweetness as the mountain daisy or the wild rose. It is absolutely a gift of nature on which man cannot improve."

"Nature has many instances of the humble and lowly

¹ *Notes on Chaucer*, in *Mod. Lang. Review*, iv (1908), p. 19.

raised to high degree, but none more strikingly beautiful than this. One of the lowest of earth's creatures, suffering a misfortune, furnishes a wonderful lesson upon the uses of pain and adversity by converting its affliction into a precious gem symbolical of all that is pure and beautiful. As written by a forgotten poet: 'Forasmuch as the pearl is a product of life, which from an inward trouble and from a fault produces purity and perfection, it is preferred; for in nothing does God so much delight as in tenderness and lustre born of trouble and repentance.' As the great [fourteenth-century] Persian poet Hafiz says:

'Learn from yon orient shell to love thy foe,
And store with pearls the wound that brings thee woe.'

"No Oriental divinity, no object of veneration has been without this ornament; no poetical production has lacked this symbol of purity and chastity."¹

IV.

We now come to a discussion of the question which seems to be of chief interest to modern critics, namely, the autobiographical element in the poem. Is *The Pearl* an elegy deliberately written by a father to commemorate the death of a little daughter of his own? To be sure, the poet does not say that it was; he never refers to the child he represents himself as seeing in a vision as his or anybody's child; nor does the child in heaven refer to the dreamer as her or anybody's father. But ought we to pay any attention to this? *Must* not the child have been his own? We, in

¹Quotations from Kunz and Stevenson, *Book of the Pearl*, pp. 305, 47, 3.

our own age, should enjoy the poem more if it were a strictly "personal" elegy. *Must* it not have been?

"What a poet does not reveal in elegy should surprise nobody," says Dr. Osgood (p. xxxiv); and so, provided there is nothing at all revealed, we have *carte blanche* to imagine what we like and to insist that it is true. "Elegy is generally reticent," continues Dr. Osgood, "and especially so in the utterance of grief and struggle of so private a nature as that intimated in *The Pearl*." To be sure, there does not seem to be anything so essentially "private" about a man's losing his daughter that if he were to undertake to write "what is obviously an elegy" about the situation, he should never mention the fact that he ever had a daughter. But let that be. There is no limit to the "intimations" any seeker may discover in an imaginative work to suit himself. Professor Gollancz, for example, finds in our poem, at one time an intimation of the poet's domestic unhappiness due to an unfaithful wife, at another an intimation of the fact that Pearl was the poet's "love-child" by some other unnamed woman. Miss Mead finds in a line saying that princes delight to set the gem pearl in pure gold a "tender" intimation that the girl Pearl had golden hair; while Dr. Osgood thinks the same words intimate that the poet "may have provided costly sepulture for the child." Dr. Osgood finds "prophetically but faintly" in the opening lines a "note of peace and triumph," though these contain nothing but a description of a stone. Translating a passage which seems to mean only "I lack pearls" by "I am undone with sin,"¹ he had an intimation that *The Pearl* "opens shadowed recesses of a struggling soul, unpenetrated with light of heaven, and dismal with the echoes of a bootless plaint. *Here and*

¹ See below, p. 663, n.

there, out of the gloom, grins the hideous face of some past sin, some nameless fear, of depression, loneliness, and despair.”¹ He had a further intimation that the poet’s “emotional experiences had been self-centred,” but that “a serious, almost prosaic experience, familiar to all men of high spiritual aspiration is “figured in *The Pearl*.”² Professor Gollancz, who with many others, had an intimation that Pearl was an *only* child,³ had this private intimation that “with the loss of his Pearl a blight seems to have fallen on the poet’s life, and poetry seems gradually to have lost its charm for him.”⁴ (Let the word “seems” be thrice underlined, since the idea is grasped out of pure air!) “*Cleanness* and *Patience*,” he adds, “were written probably⁵ some few years after *Pearl*; and the numerous references in those two poems to the sea would lead one to infer that the poet may have weathered the fierce tempests he describes. His wanderings may have brought him even to the holy city whose heavenly prototype he discerned in the visionary scenes of *Pearl*”—“Glosyng is a full glorious thing, certeyn!”

I have already shown that the general predisposition to regard the poem as first and foremost a personal elegy has been based in part on misunderstandings and wrong translations of the opening stanza; that, furthermore, the poem from beginning to end is insistently symbolical, with an interweaving of allegory; and that, as for the author,

¹ Introduction to translation, pp. xvi, xii.

² See above, p. 638 f.

³ Miss Jewett speaks of the poem (p. x) as “the lament of a father for a little, *long-lost* daughter.”

⁴ *Camb. Hist.*, I, 331.

⁵ The probability is exactly the opposite, if one may judge from progress in the poet’s art; see my previous article, p. 165, and Osgood, edition, p. xlix. For further intimations to Professor Gollancz, see p. 672, n. 2.

“souning in moral vertu was his speche.” The most casual reader will recognize that the poet is a careful, painstaking artist, that he uses an exceedingly complicated metre, and that his work is very elaborate in structure.¹ Finally, no one will deny that he would not have written as he did, had it not been for the particular vogue of various literary devices favored in his day and used innumerable times as the induction to, or vehicle of, allegory—such as the dream, the vision, and the debate.

In *The Pearl* the plan of the poet is to represent himself as falling asleep in a beautiful garden, under the sensuous influences of singing birds and fragrant flowers, by way of induction to an imaginary vision of a little child, first in the earthly and later in the heavenly paradise. In the mouth of this little child, he arranged to place instruction, to be elicited by the dreamer in dialogue, regarding the condition of maidens like her, Brides of the Lamb, in heaven, an interpretation of the parable of the vineyard in its relation to the much-vexed controversy of the time on good works *vs.* grace as a means of gaining eternal rewards, and a description of the New Jerusalem, after the fashion of the Apocalypse.

It is difficult to understand how anyone acquainted with mediæval literature and familiar with the very numerous dream-poems, vision-poems, debates, and allegories of divers sorts current in the fourteenth century, could think of these features of the poem as anything more than conventions which a fourteenth-century poet would most naturally have employed as a means of presenting his thought, and which, in the case of the author of *The Pearl*, were altogether suitable to his theme. Yet, Dr. Osgood

¹ To Miss Mead the poem is “simple indeed as a little child” (p. xviii).

inclines to think that even the dream may be no device. He calls it a "device" (p. xiv) and was aware of innumerable parallels;¹ but he suggests, nevertheless, that the poet may have had "an *actual* dream which comforted him in his grief and which he elaborated into his poem" (p. xvii). Now, who can deny this? Is it therefore true? Dr. Osgood points out that the author adopts a "curious practice of fourteenth-century poets," that of dating the poem: the author says (as we have seen²) that his dream occurred "in August in a high season," i. e., doubtless, about the day of the Assumption of the Virgin. "The appropriateness of the date of this feast to the theme of the poem is obvious," says Dr. Osgood; but still he suggests that this may be the day of the "actual dream," or "the date of the poet's conception of his work." When the dreamer fell asleep, he heard a "sweet song."³

¹ In his own words (p. xiv f.): "The device of the sleep and the vision in field or wood was put to a great variety of uses in the fourteenth century. Besides the traditional use as the setting for a love-poem or for the praise of women, it was also employed in allegory of a moral or homiletic cast; in parables, *dits* and *contes*; in satire, both political and ecclesiastical; in eulogy; in poems treating a combination of these themes; and finally, as in *The Pearl* and Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess*, in elegy."

² See above, p. 616, n. 2.

³ Cf. Boccaccio's *Eclogue* (l. 38): "Quos insuper audio cantus," etc. We wonder if the birds of the earthly paradise took a similar interest in him and dictated his poem.

"For, quen þose brydde, her wynges, bete,
þay songen wyth a swete asent;
So gracios gle coupe no mon gete
As here & se her adubement" (93 ff.).

Think of the rapture ("gracios gle") of composition!

With *The Pearl* one might well compare the opening and ending of the Anglo-Saxon *Be Domes Dæge*, a translation of the *De Die Iudicii*, ascribed to Bede (ed. Lumby, EETS., 65).

“This,” says Dr. Osgood (p. xvii, n.), “seems to designate *The Pearl* itself or at least the part from l. 61 on,” “or at least the poet’s first conception of it” (p. 55)!

Now, inasmuch as no one can prove that the author had not an “actual dream,” no one can prove that it did not occur just at the obvious time. And if we dispose of this mist of an “actual dream,” it does not matter much what one thinks of the autobiographical element implied in the alternative, that it was the date of “the poet’s conception of his work.” If it is pleasing for any one to think so, let him think so. There is in any case no gainsaying the possibility. But somehow we fancy that when a poet dated his poem (as was the custom in his age) by dating the event of his poem, a would-be dream, at the most suitable time of the year for him to have had that dream, or to have conceived the scheme of imagining that he had a dream at that particular time, he knew what he was about. Without inquiring too closely into that “sweet song” that the dreamer heard in his dream (which means “*The Pearl* itself, or at least the part from l. 61 on,” “or at least the poet’s first conception of it”), or discussing whether or no the author was another Sigurth, or a Cædmon, or a Halbjörn Hali, or some other supernaturally-aided, legendary person—we might go the whole way at once. Why not state, with the calm dignity of assurance which is based on the impossibility of denial—not simply that the poet had a young daughter called by the suitable name Margery, who appropriately died at the age when it was suitable for the argument he wished to advance, and that her mother and all other relatives and friends were conveniently got rid of in some unexplained way, and that, at the most appropriate time of the year for it to happen, he dreamt a dream, or it came to him to say that

he dreamt a dream, in which he heard his poem sung as a "sweet song"—but also that he saw in the aforesaid dream just what he says he saw, in its perfection of suitability for an artistic setting, and listened while his dear Pearl narrated for him the parable of the vineyard, and showed him paradise. He might have, of course,—one sees strange things in dreams, and sometimes one's dreams have a strange likeness to the thing one wants to dream, or have heard that others have dreamt. It is really appalling to what pleasurable lengths of possibility the argument would lead. Surely, it ought to be apparent to every scholar not only that the dream is a device, the place is a device, and the date is a device, but also that the things seen and the way they are seen, and the words that are spoken, are fashioned artistically, with deliberate care, for a thoughtful purpose.

It is evident that, given the convention of the setting, and general "machinery," the very minimum of personal relationship between the dreamer and the maiden is established. All that the poet says is that, alone at night, he laments having lost his pearl, and that the contrast is great between her condition and his, for he remains behind, pensive, despairing, desolate, a joyless jeweller, while she is happy, without anxiety or strife, in paradise. The poet might have represented the maiden as his daughter—as a poetic device, to add interest to the poem, without any foundation in fact; but he does not even do that. One cannot affirm that *The Pearl* is even an *imaginary* vision of a "father" without going beyond the information in the text.

Great stress is laid by most of those who seek first and foremost "personal allusions" in the poem, on the statements made by the dreamer when he first catches sight

of Pearl beyond the marvellous mere, sitting at the foot of a crystal cliff: "I knew her well, I had seen her ere,"¹ and "long I gazed upon her there,—the longer, I knew her more and more" (st. 14). But any one acquainted with mediæval literature should know that this is a mere convention.² I need not repeat what I wrote in my article on this point (pp. 177 ff.), but shall simply ask the reader to consider, by way of example, the appearance of a beautiful lady to Boethius in his mute distress, and how he came gradually to recognize in her his nurse Philosophy, who had come from on high to comfort him and give him good instruction; or the appearance of the "lady of lovely countenance" in the *Vision of Piers Plowman* who descended from a cliff and addressed the dreamer gently as "Son":³ only gradually did he come to know her as Holy Church, who had received him first and taught him the Faith, and whom he had vowed to love faithfully while his life should last. Many an allegorical visitant who came to comfort and counsel a lonely man was thus represented as having been known to him before, but not at first recognized when she appeared under such strange conditions. In *The Pearl*, the maiden who approached the dreamer bore in physical form no likeness at all to the little child whom the author represents himself as having lost. She was in symbolical raiment, covered with pearls, with

¹ Miss Mead (p. xxi) calls this a "pregnant phrase."

² Of course, to use a convention is not necessarily to be "conventional"; cf. Osgood, edition, p. lv.

³ In Sir David Lyndesay's *First Buke of the Monarchy*, the poet begs the venerable man Experience, who appears to him in a dream, to give him, "a desolate man," counsel. The old man does so, but first rebukes him for desiring the impossible.

"Thou art a great fool, Son, said he,
Things to desire which may not be" (359).

a crown of pearl, with a pearl at her breast, in gleaming white attire, fully mature—and a most accomplished expounder of the verities of the Christian religion. By no possibility could the dreamer have recognized her as any infant, less than two years old, whom he had known on earth. In saying, then, that the longer he looked at her the more he knew her, he is, in all probability, simply borrowing a feature from earlier allegorical vision literature.

The feature of the child's maturity after death is paralleled in Boccaccio's eclogue *Olympia*, which, as I tried to show in my previous article (pp. 203 ff.), stands in particularly close relationship to *The Pearl*, being probably the starting-point of our poet's conception. Dr. Osgood, who agrees (p. xxxv) that the latter is indebted to Boccaccio, writes on this point as follows (p. xxv): "Chronological facts seem to show that Violante's [*i. e.*, *Olympia's*] maturity in the vision is not that which she would have attained at the time of the vision had she lived, but merely a concession for sake of verisimilitude in the dialogue. The case may have been similar in *The Pearl*. Or very likely the reason in both cases may have been theological." Dr. Osgood's quotations from St. Augustine in support of his last statement are important. Pearl's maturity is also a convention.

Boccaccio pictures his dead child as "ea in etate in qua morientes celestes effici cives credimus"—and, he adds: "et ideo ex Violante dum viveret, mortuam celestam, id est Olympiam, voco." Boccaccio, then, changed the name of his child from Violante to Olympia because she had become celestial. Surely, this should make cautious those who imagine (and nearly everybody is practically certain about it) that Pearl on earth was called Margaret, or

Marguerite, or Margery; for Pearl is the same sort of celestial name as Olympia.¹ We remember St. Aldhelm's description of maidens as "Margaritæ Christi, paradisi gemmæ." Quite as good a case, however, might be made out for "Rose" as the girl's name on earth, if she really must be given one. We recall that in the first speech she makes to the dreamer, in reply to his question: "Art thou my pearl," etc., she says:

"'twas but a Rose that thou didst lose,
that bloomed and withered, as nature bade;
through the casket's grace, that held it secure,
now 'tis proved a Pearl of price" (st. 23).

And later he says: "My pearl, thou art so rich, so radiant a rose" (76). Rose was the name of an English maiden in the twelfth century, to whom Hilarius, a disciple of Abelard, wrote a poem,² and it must have been popular as a maiden's name in England in the fourteenth century, if only because of its connection with the Virgin Mary or the suggestion of the *Romance of the Rose*. But this gues-

¹ Cf. Lydgate, *Reason and Sensuality*, ll. 665 ff.:

"Th' orient, which ys so bryght
And casteth forth so clere a lyght
Betokeneth in especiall
Things that be celestiall,
And things, as I kan diffyne
That be verrelly dyvyne."

There is much in the setting of this poem that reminds one of *The Pearl*. The author "expounds" the "heavenly empress" Nature, who appears to him in a vision.

² *Hilarii Versus et Ludi*, 1838, p. 13, "Ad Roseam": "Nomen tuum signat rosam,—et ecce virginitas."

On the use of the name Rose in literature before the *Roman de la Rose*, see E. Langlois, *Origines et Sources du R. de la R.*, Paris, 1891, pp. 40 ff.

sing is futile, except to emphasize that there is no shred of evidence to prove that, if Pearl ever had flesh and blood on earth, she was called Margaret, or Marguerite, or Margery.

It has been argued that if Boccaccio's poem was really inspired by the loss of a daughter, and if the author of *The Pearl* got his suggestion from Boccaccio, then our poet's experience, like Boccaccio's, must also have been actual.¹ But this does not in the least follow, and all probabilities point to the reverse. In the first place, the eclogue is full of personal facts, openly stated,² and Olympia always addresses the dreamer as her father, while he repeatedly calls her daughter—in glaring contrast to the complete vagueness of *The Pearl*. In the second place, while no one can deny the possibility of a similar inspiration repeating itself from a similar cause, the probability is much greater that a second work along lines already indicated is primarily due to *literary* suggestion. It is well known that poems which may have had some personal reason for their composition, have been imitated simply as poems, without any such basis of inception. A good example occurs in the Marguerite-poems of the fourteenth century.³ In Machaut's *Dit de la Marguerite* we may have, under the figure of the flower Marguerite, the daisy, explicit praise of a lady named Marguerite, who was a mistress of Pierre de Lusignan, King of Cyprus. But the fact that this poem was a success, not that there may have been other Marguerites, or other ladies who might imagine themselves to be hinted at in poems where a beautiful Mar-

¹ Coulton, *Mod. Lang. Review*, II, 43; cf. Gollancz, *Camb. Hist.*, I, 323.

² See my article, p. 214.

³ See J. L. Lowes, *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, XIX, 593 ff.; XX, 749 ff.

guerite was praised, led to the subsequent cult of the daisy and the further composition of poems on the subject by Machaut's disciples, Froissart and Deschamps. The style of the poem simply became a literary mode, and the symbolism of the daisy was perpetuated without inevitable "personal impulse." Had it not been for this mode, we should probably not have the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, in praise of Alcestis, under whose conventional semblance certain critics are ill content not to be permitted to see a faithful portrait of Queen Anne.¹

But is there any straw of evidence for the autobiographical theory to which we moderns, who long so much for assurance on this point, can clutch with reliance? The longer we study the matter, the clearer it becomes that our wish only was father to the thought. Yet, in truth, there is one straw—one line of the poem—to which all who believe the work to be strictly elegiac finally cling for justification of their point of view: "Ho watȝ me nerre þen aunte or nece" (233). "This and other personal allusions in the poem," says Dr. Osgood, "admit of no allegorical interpretation, and could only obscure and obstruct the poet's intention had he been writing allegory." The "other personal allusions," which Dr. Osgood indicates, are ll. 1-60 (we have seen how "personal" they are); ll. 373-380 (which we shall presently discuss, pp. 662 ff. below); and l. 743: "I rede thee forsake the mad world" (on which see the comment in a note below²).

¹ Mr. Coulton says that "for the daisy [Chaucer] has a love so tender, so intimate, that it is difficult not to suspect under the flower some unknown Marguerite of flesh and blood" (*Chaucer and his England*, London, 1908, p. 112).

² This remark of the maiden to the dreamer, Dr. Osgood thinks personal enough to argue from it that the poet was not an ecclesiastic. "She would," he says, "hardly have given [this advice]

It should be said first that no one to my knowledge has ever tried to give these lines an "allegorical interpretation"; all that I at any rate have contended is that they, as well as other parts of the structure and "machinery" of the poem, need not be taken with literal exactness as a revelation on the part of the author that the Pearl of his vision was his own dead daughter. But if the line quoted is to be taken literally and regarded as significant, positive, autobiographical evidence, outweighing all the emphatic negative evidence, of relationship, we should see exactly what inference may be drawn from it.

Mr. Coulton¹ seems to think the passage unimportant.

if he had already forsaken it" [the world]! But, obviously, this is to introduce into a general phrase a particular meaning not intended. We read in Matthew XIX, 29, in the very passage where Jesus relates the parable of the vineyard, which occupies so large a part of *The Pearl*: "And every one that hath *forsaken* houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life." "Forsaking the world" is not, of course, equivalent to "taking holy orders." The following passage from the *Pricke of Conscience* (p. 163, l. 6034) shows the meaning clearly enough:

"First þas þat with Crist sal deme þat day
And noght be demed er namly þai
þat here forsuke þe werldes solace
and folowed rightly Cristes trace,
Als his apostels and other ma,
þat for his luf tholed angre and wa."

Hugo of St. Victor (*Allegoriae in Novum Testamentum*, Bk. II, ch. 25, *Patr. Lat.*, 175, col. 794) quoting Matt. XIII, "Simile est," etc., adds: "Bonae margaritae, lex et prophetae, una pretiosa, Salvatoris scientia: omnia vero vendit et istam emit, qui sicut Paulus, veteribus observationibus renuntiat, ut Christum lucrifaciat. *Item omnia vendit et pretiosam margaritam emit, qui pro amore caelestium terrena contemnit.*"

¹ *Mod. Lang. Review*, II, 40.

He says: "It is sufficiently evident that the author here describes the girl as 'nearer to me than aunt or niece' for the same reason which makes him assure us two lines higher up that 'there was no gladder man between here and Greece'—it suited his rhyme." No doubt; but, if that is true, what is its bearing on the question of autobiography in the poem? Suppose in this passage the author simply chose the word "niece" because it rhymed with "Greece," does that explain the fact that where he did not need a word of relationship for that purpose, he made no reference to *any* relationship between himself and the child? Mr. Coulton refers me to Violante and Beatrice, and Dr. Osgood to Blanche the Duchess; but Boccaccio says explicitly that "Olympia" was his own daughter, and Dante that Beatrice was his beloved, while Chaucer makes plain who "good, fair White" was.

Mr. Coulton proclaimed that I was in error in saying that "the poet tells nothing whatever about the living child," since, as my critic pointed out triumphantly, the poet does tell us the color of her hair. But is this true? What we learn from the poem is simply the color of the hair of the maiden whom the dreamer is represented as seeing in paradise! According to the poet's description, the *heavenly* Pearl had, indeed, long, fair hair; but, as I remarked in my previous article (p. 183), so, according to the description of Guillaume de Lorris, had various allegorical figures in the *Roman de la Rose*: *e. g.*, Franchise "ot les chevous et blons et lons," and as for Beauty, "Les cheveus ot blons et si lons Qu'il li batoient as talons." Moreover, in the same connection in *The Pearl*, it is said that the maiden wore a pearl crown and other "royal array." If Mr. Coulton is right in claiming that the poet's words here prove that an earthly child Pearl

(Margery?) had long, fair hair, he must also believe that this child wore a pearl crown ("subtle," Mr. Coulton calls it) and other royal array. Here is an interesting autobiographical "lead" hitherto neglected: "perhaps" the young girl the poet mourned was really a princess, and "perhaps" he had in mind some such person as Margaret, daughter of Edward III (to whom the King gave two thousand pearls as a wedding present) who might have died young!

The passage in question is as follows:

"As schorne golde schyr her fax þenne schon,
On schyldere, þat leghe vnlapped ly,te.
Her depe colour, yet wonted non
Of precios perle in porfyl py,te" (213 ff.).

If we wish to envisage Pearl exactly, we should carefully observe the last two lines. No translator apparently has doubted that "colour" in the third line (note the editor's italicized *ur*) is our word "colo(u)r." Professor Gollancz, Mr. Coulton, Dr. Mitchell, and Miss Mead take the "deep color" to pertain to the girl's "locks" or "tresses," whereas Dr. Osgood and Miss Jewett write "her color." Professor Gollancz translates: "though deep their colour, they needed not those precious pearls on her robe bedight"; Dr. Osgood: "Yet her color was deep, wanting not the adornment of the precious pearls in broidery all about"; and other translators with similar vagueness in the sense. Was Pearl's fair hair, or was her complexion, of a "deep color"? The question will not trouble us after we have recognized the fact¹ that the word at this point always translated "color" is really "collar." All the passage

¹ Pointed out by Professor Cook, *Mod. Phil.*, vi, 197 ff.

means is that there was no lack of precious pearls in the embroidered border of her deep collar.

When Pearl first appears to the dreamer, he marvels at her "fair face" and her "royal array," that shone like "glistening gold." She had a "visage white as smooth ivory" that increasingly bewildered him. Her gown, we read, was all gleaming white, open at the sides, and bordered with the loveliest pearls the dreamer had ever seen with his eyes; her sleeves were broad and adorned with a double braid of pearls; her kirtle was bright, of the self-same stuff; each hem of her dress (at the wrist, the sides, and the openings) was embroidered with white pearls; her hair, as we have seen, shining like pure gold, lay loose on her shoulders, and her deep collar wanted nought "of precios perle in porfyl pyghte." "I trow," says the poet, "no tongue might e'er avail to speak of that sight a fitting word."

This description, including the part concerning the collar, finds illustration in an almost contemporaneous allegorical poem, the *Assembly of Ladies*¹ (*Assemblée de Dames*), of which Loyalty is the central figure. The author disclaims any power to describe this lady's beauty, for never in his life had he seen one so "inly fair."

"In her estate, assured utterly,
There wanted nought, I dare you well assure,
That longed to a goodly crëature."

"And furthermore, to speke of her aray,
I shal you tel the maner of her gown;
Of clothe of gold ful riche, it is no nay;
The colour blew, of a right good fasoun;
In tabard-wyse the slevës hanging doun;
And what purfyl there was, and in what wyse,
So as I can, I shal it you devyse.

¹ *Chaucerian and Other Pieces*. (Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, ed. Skeat, VII), Oxford, 1897, p. 397; cf. note p. 538.

"After a sort the collar and the vent,
 Lyk as ermyne is mad in purfeling;
 With grete perlës, ful fyne and orient,
 They were couchèd, al after oon worching,
 With dyamonds in stede of powdering:
 The slevës and purfilles of assyse;
 Thay were [y-] mad [ful] lyke, in every wyse.

"Aboute her nekke a sort of fair rubyes,
 In whyte floures of right fyne enamyl;
 Upon her heed, set in the freshest wyse,
 A cercle with gret balays of entayl;
 That, in earnest to speke, withouten fayl,
 For yonge and olde, and every maner age,
 It was a world to loke on her visage."

It will be observed that, in this very similar description of a lady's attire, the author emphasizes how the collar and slit of her gown were alike (after one pattern) bordered "in purfeling" with large pearls, full fine and Orient. Loyalty was suitably dressed in blue, with rubies above all for ornaments: she wore "a sort (set) of fair rubies, in white flowers of right fine enamel" about her neck, and "a circle with a large finely-cut balas-ruby" on her head—whereas Pearl, also suitably, was dressed in white, with pearls exclusively for ornaments: she wore a crown of pure white pearls "with figured flowers wrought thereon," and a large, wondrous pearl lay on her breast. Finally, one should note the similar inductions of the poems. The author of the *Assembly* represents a woman "all for-wearied" as falling asleep in a beautiful "arbor, fair and green," one day in September, "at the falling of the leaf," after "the corn was gathered in the sheaf." whereupon she had her vision of Loyalty and her attendants, all alike clad in blue.¹

¹ In the *Legend of Good Women*, the God of Love had "gilte heer . . . corowned with a sonne" (B. 230). His queen, "Alceste the

One might also compare in this connection *The Flower and the Leaf* (freely rendered by Dryden), which Professor Skeat thinks is by the same author as the *Assembly*.¹ Here, similarly, we have the beautiful green arbor, flowers and fragrance, sleep, dream, procession of ladies and knights marvellous in appearance and attire, the dreamer's questions of a lady "al in whyte, with semblance ful demure," and her answers to her "fair daughter." The ladies were divided into two groups; those, clad in white, who served the Leaf and their queen Diana, "goddess of chastity," and those, clad in green, who served the Flower and their queen Flora. The former, we read, were dressed in white surcoats, the seams of which were set with strings of emeralds "as it were a maner garnishing"; "*many a rich stone was set upon the purfils . . . of collars, sleeves, and trains round about, as great pearls, round and Orient*" and other stones; each had on her head "a rich fret of gold" full of stately stones, and a chaplet of leaves (141 ff.). Diana, with her "heavenly-figured face" and her "well-shaped person," surpassed them all in beauty and, "more richly beseen," wore a crown of gold. The trumpeters of the white knights had "*about their nekkes, with gret perlës set, Colers brode*" (214-15). The ladies in green attending Queen Flora were all in surcoats that

debonayre" was "clad in real (royal) habit grene" (214) and on her head she wore a "fret of gold" surmounted with a white crown made "of o (one) perle fyne, oriental" (221). She was:

"So womanly, so benigne, and so meke,
That in this world, thogh that men wolde seke,
Half hir beautee shulde men nat finde
In creature that formed is by kinde" (243 ff.).

¹ *Chaucerian and Other Pieces*, pp. 361 ff.; cf. pp. lxii ff. Prof. Skeat says (p. lxiv): "Surely these descriptions of seams, and collars, and sleeves, are due to a woman." In that case, what shall we say of those in *The Pearl*?

were richly "purfyled" with many a rich stone; each had a chaplet on her head "which did right well upon *the shining hair*"; a lady, to whom each one "enclyned" humbly (cf. *Pearl*, 236) sang, "si doucë est la Margarete."

Such comparisons as these¹ not only make certain the translation "collar" in the passage under discussion, but also show the conventions of description, as well as dream-setting, that the author (most naturally and properly) utilized in shewing-forth his thought.

Yet, if any readers are unable to see the bearing of such parallels on the question of personal feeling and actual description in the poem, if they absolutely demand some personal relationship between the poet and Pearl, I think they should seek the key elsewhere. What might be regarded as a reference to relationship, is found in stanza 32:

"My bliss and bale thou hast been both,
but much the greater hath been my moan;
since thou wast banished from every path,"²

¹ With such phrases from *The Pearl* as: "þe myrreste margarys, at my deuyse, þat euer I seþ, yet with myn yþen" (199 f.), cf. "It was more pleasaunt than I coud devyse," "That ever yet in al my lyf I sy" (*F. and L.*, 199, 87); with "baysment gef myn hert a brunt," "with yþen open & mouth ful clos, I stod as hende as hawk in halle. I hope þat gostly watþ, þat porpose" (*Pearl*, 174 ff.), cf. "as it were a sot, I stood astonied; so was I with the song Through ravished, that, [un]til late and long Ne wist I in what place I was, ne where," "as me thought, I surely ravished was Into Paradyse" (*F. L.*, 174 ff.); with *Pearl*, 223 ff., cf. "To tell right their greet beautè, it lyth not in my might, Ne their array" (*F. L.*, 138 ff.); with *Pearl*, 213, "of self sute," cf. "in a sute," "in sute," "al in a sute" (*F. L.*, 227, 335, 340); with *Pearl*, 215, "wonted non," cf. "nothing lakked" *F. L.*, 426); with *Pearl*, 221, "her semblaunt sade," cf. "with semblance ful demure" (*F. L.*, 459); cf. "her countenaunce ful sad and ful demure" (*A. of L.*, 82), with *Pearl*, 231, "heþen into Greece," cf. "fro this countrey til Inde" (*A. of L.*, 482).

² The word in the text *woþe* is doubtful in meaning. Professor

I wist not where my pearl was gone,
 but now I see it, my sorrow is eased:
 when we were parted we were at one,
 God forbid we be now wroth;
we meet so seldom by stock or stone;
 though thou canst speak with such fair grace,
 I am but dust and margeries miss (lack);¹
 but the mercy of Christ, and Mary and John,
 they are the ground of all my bliss."

This is absolutely the only hint in the poem of any meeting-place between the poet and Pearl, the only hint of any manner of human association,² and it is certainly

Gollancz derives it from A. S. *wáþ*; cf. Ger. *weide*; but Dr. Osgood derives it from O. N. *vapi*, danger. Therefore I draw no inferences from the passage.

¹The passage reads "I am bot mol & marerez mysse." Mr. Gollancz, emending *marerez* to *marrez*, renders the last clause, "grief woundeth me"; Dr. Mitchell: "my joy is gone"; Mr. Coulton: "heaviness." Dr. Osgood in his translation renders it "undone with sin"; in his edition (p. 70) he writes: "*marerez mysse*. A botcher's blunder'? that is, I am worth no more than a botcher's blunder, good for nothing. But this is a bit forced. Holthausen and a reviewer in *Ath.*, 1891. 184 suggests *manerez mysse*, i. e., 'I lack manners,' but *N. E. D.* shows that 'manners' was not employed in this sense till much later."—Miss Jewett (following Dr. Osgood) translates the words: "my deeds amiss"; Miss Mead (following Professor Holthausen, *Archiv*, xc, 146): "lack manners."

I would suggest that for *marerez* we read *marierez* or *margerez*, i. e., "margeries" (French *margeries*); cf. *mariorys* (206), *margarys* (199), *margyrye* (1037)—the meaning being: "I am but dust and lack margeries (pearls) [such as beautify you in heaven, 'wyth precios perlez al vmbepyte' (204, etc.)]." The same sort of contrast is found in ll. 905 ff.: "I am but muck and mul (dust) the while, and thou so rich a radiant ("reken") rose";—and notably in the oft-quoted stanza (21) beginning: "'O Perle,' quod I, 'in perlez pyt,'" where the dreamer contrasts his loneliness on earth with her joy in paradise, concluding: "Since we were separated and torn asunder, I have been a joyless jeweller" (251-2).

²"Meet," to be sure, is in the present tense; but it suggests past meetings of the sort now missed. Would a *father* ever speak of meeting his own daughter "by stock or stone," and nowhere else?

not inconsistent with the other supposedly personal statement that the child was nearer [and dearer] to him than aunt or niece. "Perhaps" we have here the secret of the whole story: it was not the loss of his own child that the poet had in mind, but only that of a little girl whom he had been accustomed to meet "by stock or stone" (*i. e.*, by the wayside), and had become devotedly attached to. She called forth his tenderness specially, for he had nothing else as the ground of his bliss "but the mercy of Christ and Mary and John." Here, no doubt, the ecclesiastic speaks. Is it not significant that the only information the poet gives us about Pearl on earth is:

"Thou didst not live two years in our land,
God thou couldst not please or pray,
Ne'er knewest thou paternoster or creed"? (483 ff.)

All the poet says about the child is just what the priest would know—that she was under two years of age when she died and had not as yet learned the Pater Noster or Creed. Now, as Dr. Osgood notes (p. 73), giving sufficient illustration of his statement: "From Bede's time down the English clergy were instructed to see that the people, particularly the children, should know at least the Pater Noster and the Creed." Everything, it is evident, fits in admirably; and the picture of the lonely priest, whose comfort was drawn not from human loves and associations, but from the mercy of Christ and Mary and John, deprived by death of this little child who had become nearer and dearer to him than aunt or niece,—and whose loss he lamented "alone at night," is really quite moving. Perhaps, his only near relatives were worldings, who thought little of living a life pure and undefiled, with an eye single to God's glory; and, lacking a child of his own, his heart

went out particularly to this little one whom he saw often as he passed to and fro from his dwelling, and undertook to teach the Paternoster and Creed.

It is perhaps hardly necessary for me to say that I do not think this sort of conjecture justifiable; ¹ but I submit: it accounts for all the facts far better than any other hypothesis as to the personal element in the poem that has as yet been advanced. Disprove it, who can?

Here I should like to call attention to a fine modern poem by the Dorsetshire poet—William Barnes (1801-86):

MATER DOLOROSA.

I'd a dream to-night
 As I fell asleep.
 O! the touching sight
 Makes me still to weep:
 Of my little lad,
 Gone to leave me sad,
 Ay, the child I had,
 But was not to keep.

As in heaven high,
 I my child did seek,
 There in train came by
 Children fair and meek,
 Each in lily white,
 With a lamp alight;
 Each was clear to sight,
 But they did not speak.

¹ I recognize that the phrase "by stock or stone" is a common alliterative phrase and ought not to have its meaning forced. It is foolish to take passages out of their context or be too literal. Pearl in paradise is described as "stout and stiff" (779)! In Jerusalem they "stretch in the street" (971). Does the author's remark, "I wist never where my pearl was gone," indicate that he was an agnostic?

Then, a little sad,
Came my child in turn.
But the lamp he had,
O it did not burn!
He, to clear my doubt,
Said, half turn'd about,
'Your tears put it out;
Mother, never mourn.'

Could one find in small compass a more striking parallel to *The Pearl*—dream, vision, procession in heaven, conversation of dreamer with dead child, and the latter's counsel to the former to abandon unwise grief? The poem tingles with emotion, and would surely seem to be the outcome of a great personal loss. It has plainly more personal touches than *The Pearl*: "my little lad," "the child I had," "mother," etc. Did we know no more of Barnes than we know of the author of *The Pearl*, no one could prove that this poem was not autobiographical to the full. Had a sceptic as to the necessity of drawing such a conclusion ventured to dwell upon the fact that the fundamental conception of the lyric—that a mourner's tears cause sorrow to the departed—is a very old Teutonic idea, and may be found embodied in literature at least seven centuries earlier, in the poetic *Edda* in the touching poem concerning Sigrun and Helgi, as well as in such ballads as "The Unquiet Grave,"¹ etc., he would no doubt have been told that he was only a scholar and not a literary critic. But, as good luck would have it for our instruction, we know that the author was, not a "mourning mother," but a man, that he never lost a son, and that the poem was purely imaginative. Barnes's daughter, Lucy Baxter ("Leader

¹ See F. J. Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, Boston, 1886, II, 234 ff.

Scott" ¹), in writing the life of her father, chances to say that he "had heard the dream as happening to a friend of his daughter in the north of England." Barnes was a poet, who had many characteristics in common with the author of *The Pearl*; but of that we need not now speak. Nor need we dwell on the fact that the same legendary idea was handled similarly, within a few years after Barnes's poem appeared by several other writers in England, some of whom had had a personal loss.² The fact stands out definite and enlightening that this poem was in no wise "personal," though it bears far more appearance of being so than *The Pearl*.

I contended in my previous article that the poem was "not in the least elegiac or autobiographical *as hitherto regularly regarded by scholars and critics*." Obviously, this did not mean either: 1. that it was not partly in the *form* of an elegy; or 2. that it did not reveal in any way the *temperament*, the psychological experience, of the author. It did, however, mean that in my opinion, *to judge from the poem*, there was no likelihood that the author was lamenting the death of a little girl of his own, by name Margaret, or Marguerite, or Margery, which affliction was the great crisis in his life, deprived him of all zest for poetry, turned him to the study of divinity, and determined his later didacticism. The poem is openly an elegy, just as it is a dream, a vision, a debate, and a homily; but I can yet find no evidence whatever that it is elegiac "as hitherto regularly regarded by scholars and critics": it gives us no warrant for saying that the author was ever married at all, or ever had a child other than one of his own imagination.

¹ *Life of William Barnes, Poet and Philologist*, London, 1887, p. 242.

² See *Life*, above, p. 242.

Now, my critics have advanced no arguments in rebuttal of mine, to prove that the poem was genuinely elegiac or autobiographical. They have contented themselves with saying: "But it *might have been*; he cannot *prove* that it is not."

"And whoso seith of trouthe I varie,
Bid him preven the contrarie."

They have demanded, with a strange insistence, as if the burden of proof were on me and not on them, that I should demonstrate that what they read into the poem *could* not have been true, when, from the very nature of the case, such demonstration, as they well know, is impossible, unless the poet should rise from the dead to state the facts. Of course, I am not disposed to accept the challenge to prove that the author was a priest, that, if so, he had not been a married layman before he took orders, or that, again if so, he had not a daughter who died. I have no hesitation in avowing my complete ignorance on these points. The author *may* have been in one of a hundred positions before he wrote his poem. He may have had one or more wives before he took orders (if he ever did). He may have had one or more children, who died or did not die. Who on earth can tell? Yet, I repeat, it is certainly significant that he never once speaks of the child whom he *represents* himself as mourning as his own in the flesh, and he never gives the vaguest hint that he had ever been married. Everything he is believed to have written¹ seems to show that he was a holy man of singularly pure

¹ It is only a conjecture that he actually did write the four, or more, poems that are attributed to him. I have myself no doubt about his authorship of *Cleanness* and *Patience*; but there is much to be said against the attribution to him of *Gawain and the Green Knight*.

character who loathed unchastity, and that he was a trained theologian, who had a theological purpose (whatever else he may have had) in writing *The Pearl*. If we ask ourselves, as we are all human enough to have done more than once: "Did the author have any personal experience which led him to write the poem?" the only possible answer is: "We do not know." How can any mortal deny, when he does not even know what the poet's name or station or career were, that he never lost a child of his own or sorrowed for the loss of another's. The only thing we can say with confidence—but this is important—is that there is nothing in his poem to warrant any such assertion, and that everything points the other way. It is only throwing up dust to obscure the issue, to say: "This man, though or if a priest, *might* have married, therefore he *might* have had a child"—and then to clamor for proof that he did *not* have a child.

But my critics insist: "The poem is so full of personal feeling that the author *must* be voicing a personal grief. He is a gentle, sensitive man; he knows how a father would feel under the circumstances; he *must* have been married; he *must* have had a child—and, let there be an end to argument!" Timidly one might expostulate: "Why, he was a poet; and it is the business of a poet to 'body forth the forms of things unknown'; and poets have sometimes imagined characters that seem real though their creators never themselves outwardly lived through the experiences that they represent them as having had."¹ And

¹ Mr. Sidney Lee (*Elizabethan Sonnets*, I, p. lxxiv) quotes Minto's judgment concerning Lodge's sonnets: "There is a seeming artlessness in Lodge's sonnets, a winning directness, that constitutes a great part of their charm. They seem to be uttered through a clear and pure medium straight from the heart; their tender fragrance and music come from the heart itself"—whereupon Mr. Lee remarks:

one might also add in a whisper (for a few who might comprehend): "The very transcendental nature of the feelings presented in *The Pearl* is more likely to indicate the work of a poet who had longed for a relationship that he had never realized."

In any case, let the reader recall Charles Lamb and his "Dream Children: A Reverie"¹—where the confirmed bachelor in a dream sees his "little ones" gathered about him while he tells them "stories about their elders when *they* were children." Finally, he writes, "while I stood gazing, both the children gradually grew fainter to my view, receding, and still receding, till nothing at last but two mournful features were seen in the uttermost distance, which, without speech, strangely impressed upon me the effects of speech: 'We are not of Alice, nor of thee, nor are we children at all. The children of Alice called Bartrum father. We are nothing; less than nothing; and dreams. We are only what might have been, and must wait upon the tedious shores of Lethe millions of ages, before we have existence and a name.' And immediately awakening I found myself quietly seated in my armchair, where I had fallen asleep, with the faithful Bridget [his

"Facts require the substitution in this passage for the word 'heart' of the words 'French and Italian sonneteers.'"—Note further the way in which the author of *Licia*, writing to Lady Molineux "deprecates the notion that his book enshrines any episode in his own experience. He merely claims to follow the fashion, and to imitate the 'men of learning and great parts' of Italy, France, and England, who have already written 'poems and sonnets of love.' Most men, he explains, have some personal knowledge of the passion, but experience is not an essential preliminary to the penning of amorous verse. 'A man may write of love and not be in love, as well as of husbandry and not go to the plough, or of witches and be none, or of holiness and be flat profane'" (p. lxxxii).

¹ I am indebted to Professor Kittredge for suggesting this parallel.

sister Mary] unchanged by my side—but John L. (or James Elia) was gone for ever.”¹

Without question, the poem is full of human feeling. Far from denying this, I would proclaim, if necessary, from the housetop my own conviction that the poet was a man of strong and tender emotion, which he reveals as he was bound to do, as literary art demanded, in this poem for which he adopted in part the structure of an elegy. The poem throbs with the instinct of love and gentleness: it was natural to the poet and he had the art to make us feel it.

V.

It will be noticed that in this article I have not as yet discussed the question whether the author of *The Pearl* was an ecclesiastic or not—and this deliberately; for, despite my emphatic assertion to the contrary,² some of

¹ Compare also Lamb's "Child Angel: A Dream":—"I chanced upon the prettiest, oddest, fantastical thing of a dream the other night, that you shall hear of. I had been reading the 'Loves of the Angels,' and went to bed with my head full of speculations suggested by that extraordinary legend

"I was suddenly transported, how or whither I could scarcely make out—but to some celestial region. It was not the real heaven neither—nor the downright Bible heaven—but a kind of fairy-land heaven, about which a poor human fancy may have leave to sport and air itself, I will hope, without presumption.

"Methought—what wild things dreams are!—I was present—at what would you imagine?—at an angel's gossiping.

"Whence it came, or how it came, or who bid it come, or whether it came purely of its own head, neither you nor I know—but there lay, sure enough, wrapped in its little cloudy swaddling-bands—a child angel

"And a name was given to the babe angel, and it was to be called *Ge-Urania*, because its production was of earth and heaven."

"Oh, the inexplicable simpleness of dreams"!

² See my article, pp. 157-8.

my critics ¹ have seen fit to make it appear that my argument almost stood or fell according as the author, assuming that he was an ecclesiastic, might or might not have had a child; whereas that question is one quite apart. Let the author be proved a layman, and the autobiographical element in the poem remains just where it was—non-existent.

I shall not here undertake to combat Dr. Osgood's contention that the author of *The Pearl* was a layman. It is based on considerations in general too vague and intangible to be discussed briefly.² I would simply state my opinion that, "so far as I could sift him on that argument," it is entirely unconvincing. I would, at present, call attention to only one "indication" which Dr. Osgood

¹ Notably Mr. Coulton (*Mod. Lang. Review*, II, 39 ff.), who in a rather patronizing way explains that the "key" to my heterodoxy is due to "the demonstrably false conception of mediæval life" from which I started—a "central false idea." Mr. Coulton, however, accepts Dr. Carleton Brown's contention that he was an ecclesiastic. He writes as follows: "The premiss (that he was an ecclesiastic) is indeed extremely probable; though even here it is necessary to face the fact that Dr. Brown's arguments would also prove—if we had not happened to know the contrary—that Sir Thomas More was an ecclesiastic. Still the ecclesiastic status of the author of *Pearl* is perhaps the point which stands out with the nearest approach to certainty among all our uncertainties about him; and Professor Schofield is therefore justified in building upon so likely a hypothesis." Cf. Northup, *M. L. Notes*, XXII, 21: "Dr. Brown's argument is convincing."

² Moreover, Dr. Brown can do that better than I. Professor Golancz writes (*Camb. Hist.*, I, 330): "The intensely religious spirit of the poems, together with the knowledge they everywhere display of Holy Writ and Theology, lead one to infer that he was, *at first*, destined for the service of the church; probably, he became a "clerk," studying sacred and profane literature at a monastic school, or at one of the universities; and *he may have received the first tonsure only*." Note the passages I have underlined—more intimations!

advances (p. li), that he was a layman. "It appears," he says, "in the decidedly unecclesiastical tone of his glorification of marriage at *Purity* [*i. e., Cleanness,*] 697-704." In the passage referred to, we read how God established for men the ordinance of marriage, which in Sodom had been "fouly set at nought."

"I compast hem a kynde crafte & kende hit hem derne,
 & amed hit in myn ordenaunce oddely dere,
 & dyȝt drwry þer-inne, doole alþer-swettest,
 & þe play of paramore; I portrayed my seluen;
 & made þer-to a maner myriest of oþer,
 When two *true* togeder had tyȝed hem seluen,
 Bytwene a mal & his make such merþe schulde conne (come?);
 Wel nyȝe pure paradys moȝt preue no better,
 Elleȝ þay moȝt *honestly* ayþer oþer welde" (697-705).

In a footnote at this point Dr. Osgood refers us to a work by Robert Mannyng of Brunne, "who was *probably* an ecclesiastic."¹ Inasmuch as we learn from Mannyng himself that he was a member of the Gilbertine Order of Monks and entered the Mother-house at Sempringham in 1288, Dr. Osgood might have said "certainly." Now this monk wrote as follows about marriage:

"Nothing Jesus Christ more quemeth (pleaseth)
 Than love in wedlock where men it yemeth (guard);
 Nor nothing is to man so dear,
 As woman's love in good manner,
 A good woman is man's bliss
 Where her love right and steadfast is,
 There is no solace under heaven
 Of all that a man may neven (name)
 That should a man so much glew (glee)
 As a good woman that loveth *true*."

¹ On Mannyng, see my *Eng. Lit. from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*, p. 361 and 412 ff., where the following passage is quoted.

There is striking similarity in the phraseology of this passage with that in *Cleanness*, and yet it was written by a monk! Who is to say when a passage has a "decidedly unecclesiastical tone"?

Evidently, a wrong attitude towards *The Pearl* has prevailed. Critics seem to have decided in advance, according to their inclination, that the most notable feature of the work consists in its being a strictly personal lament of a father for his own child, and have been more than willing to take a might-be in lieu of proof. Scholars who have demanded evidence have naturally pleaded an unpopular cause; but they have not allowed purely sentimental reasons to deter them from presenting the truth as they saw it. They believe that they write "in defence of *Pearl*" when they try to make clear the author's intention in its composition, and endeavor to brush away the cobweb of misconception that conceals its real significance. Yet they are convinced that it is far more important for the average reader to consider the beauty and the meaning of the work itself rather than conjectures as to its manner of inception; just as they would prefer to have a friend dwell upon the spiritual insight and artistic skill revealed in the picture of a great Madonna than upon conjectures as to the painter's patron and model.

If there are still those who think with Professor Golancz that "the personal side of the poem is *clearly* marked, though the author nowhere directly refers to his fatherhood," there is nothing further to say. Personally, my sight is so dim that what I seem to see most clearly about *The Pearl* is that it is the imaginative creation of a distinguished poet, who wrote so objectively that he has given no opportunity to those who desire to view the inner

secrets of his heart. Study the poem with the utmost care and one is bound to admit that the author does not reveal what one can be sure is a single "personal" experience of his natural life—even less than the almost contemporary author of *The Imitation of Christ*, who has so much in common with our poet. "Ama nesciri" is the mediæval motto both seem to have taken long ago; and, living nowadays, they would no doubt both wish to take it again, even did they hear of the tiresome discussions as to authorship, personal allusions and the like, which their works have aroused.

WILLIAM HENRY SCHOFIELD.

XXII.—A RECENTLY DISCOVERED FRAGMENT
OF AN OLD FRENCH MS. OF THE
FAITS DES ROMAINS.

Some time since, Mr. Paul Radin, a student of Ethnology in Columbia University, happened upon the discovery, in a second-hand book store in New York, of an early edition of the works of Lucan. On investigation, the two stout wooden boards with which the volume was bound were found to be lined with two manuscript sheets of an admirably written parchment codex (150 x 195 mm.) which Mr. Radin brought to the present writer for examination. It is by Mr. Radin's kindness that opportunity has been given to make the following communication.

The two double-column folded sheets in question belong—though unfortunately not contiguously—to the same signature of an Old French ms. dating probably from the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century. In addition to other mutilations the bottom of both sheets has been irregularly torn off in such a way as to remove several lines of fourteen out of the sixteen columns, the two remaining columns (recto and verso) being left almost intact. The legibility of the side of one of the sheets that was glued to the wooden binding has been considerably impaired by its removal from the cover, and this portion of the ms. has not been reproduced below.

A glance at the contents of the fragment was sufficient to show that the text was concerned with the life of Julius Cæsar, and, as a curious and interesting coincidence, it was discovered that the description of Cleopatra given in the anonymous thirteenth century *Faits des Romains*, and considered of sufficient interest to be quoted *in extenso*

both by Paul Meyer (*Les premières compilations françaises d'histoire ancienne*, in *Romania*, xiv, pp. 1-81; cf. pp. 18, 19), and by Parodi (*Le storie di Cesare nella Letteratura italiana dei primi secoli*, in *Studj di filologia romanza*, xi, 237 ff.), was also contained in almost complete form in the Radin fragment. In the articles of the two scholars above cited may be found detailed accounts of the *Faits des Romains*. Suffice it to remark here that M. Meyer indicates the present whereabouts of nearly forty mss. of the text, to which list Mr. Radin's modest fragment is now entitled to be added. The work was printed under the title *Lucan, Suetone & Salluste en françois*, Paris, pour A. Verard, and appeared in two editions, dated, respectively, 1490 and 1500. The former of these editions is to be found among the incunabula of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan of New York. Inasmuch as it may be of interest to compare the somewhat modernized printed version of the portrait of Cleopatra with the ms. version published by Paul Meyer and with that of the Radin fragment given later (p. 681), I will reproduce here a portion of the text of the printed passage from Mr. Morgan's volume (f. xiii^{xx} xii b fin):

Elle fut vestue de lin & de pourpre grette a or, et sy eut entour ses crins & entour son col biē grant foison des plus precieuses pierres que l'en pouoit trouuer en la rouge mer & ailleurs. Et si eut a sō col ung fermail dor & de James qui toute luy enluminoient la gorge & vnes franges larges de fin or auoit enuiron la cheuecaille et les deux chiefz luy descēdoiēt aual les piez en croix tant et tellement que son pie deuant en estoit tout enlumine. La cainture quelle portoit fut dung cuir dune beste merueilleuse & cruelle laquelle on nomme & appelle len Serpent ceste caiture fut luisante & menuement maissee.

Without undertaking to make comparisons between the versions, it may at least be pointed out that, in the above passage, the printer, or the editor, has committed an amusing blunder in transforming the lines: "*Li dui chief li descendoient aval le piz en croiz, si que son piz devant en estoit toz enluminez*" into "*les deux chiefz luy descēdoiēt aual les PIEZ en croix tant et tellement que son PIE devant en estoit tout enlumine.*"

In view of the mutilated condition of the text of the Radin fragment, it has not been considered feasible to number the lines as they are here printed, the division by columns being regarded as sufficient. The abbreviations, which are comparatively frequent in the ms. but do not involve difficulties, have been resolved for the convenience of the reader.¹

LES FAITS DES ROMAINS—RADIN FRAGMENT.

Column 1.

enlacier li e atrere a sa volunté e a s'amor. Mauffez, ce dist Lucans, l'i aporтерent, car il n'en vint onques se honte non as Romains; car onques la bialté Helene ne fist tant de mal a cax de Troie comme la bialtez de ceste fist de mal a cax de Rome, ne mes de ce que Troie en fu abatue mes Rome en remest en estant. Les .ij. qui premierement mistrent en un lit Cesar e Cleopatra e puis Antoine qui après la rama, furent comencement de la grant destruction

¹ It was the writer's intention to verify, in this article, the order and position of the contents of the fragment, by comparison with the corresponding passages in the Verard edition owned by Mr. Morgan; but in the absence of the latter from New York his library is absolutely closed, at the time when the article must be submitted for publication.

as Romains, car ele tint Cesar .ij. anz toz entiers en Egipte autresi comme pris, e avoit soi meïmes oblié e l'enor de Rome por la luxure de la desloial. Après fu Rome en aventure de la bataille qui fu desoz la premon-toire de l'Encade, que Cleopatra ne fust dame de lui e de tot le monde; car si eüst ele esté se Antoinnes eüst esté vaincu ou Octavien. Bien doit l'en pardonner a Antoine ce qu'il fu sospris de s'amor. Quant Cesar, qui tant [avait le] cuer dur en [*four lines mutilated or missing.*]

Column 2.

comme les mains sanglantes de l'ocision de Tessalle tendre en non pas de sa fame tele desloial comme fu Cleopatra. Bien avoit oblié Pompee e Julian a cui il fu freres de cele vil leignie, e despendi .ij. anz son tens en cele honteuse amor e lassa Juba en pais, e le remenant de Tessalle craistre e assaucier en Libe, e fist semblant qu'il eüst vaincu plus a oes Cleopatra que a son oes; molt l'en blasma Lucans. Cleopatra, qui fu eschapee si conme nos avons dit, fist tant qu'ele vint devant Cesar e se fia auques en sa biauté; ele fist mate chiere au plus qu'ele pot e se demena en la meniere de fame qui devoit merci crier e requerre. Ore oiez comment a le parla Cesar souverains [*eleven lines mostly obliterated.*]

Column 3.

que se toi plait ge puis m'anor recovrer par ta main. Il m'est avis que soies une clere estoile qui tot doies ralumer e la terre de tot adrecier. Ge ne quier pas del tot estre dame. Governmenz de feme n'est riens. N'a nule differ-ance entre home e fame. Lis les letres del testament mon pere. Tu puez veor qu'il lassa sa tere en quemun a moi

e a mon frere, e Je sai bien que mes freres m'amast s'il fust en sa poesté. Mes il ne fait rien par li, ancois fait quan qu'il fait per le consoil Photin, un traïtor. Biaux ch'r, ie ne quier rien de ce qui fu mon pere, ne d'autre chose, se toi ne plait; une seule chose te requier, que tu m'otrois le raigne mon pere e en oste les traïtors qui mon frere corumpent; fai que mes freres soit rois, se tu autre bien ne me fes, car il n'en a que le non; Photins e Achilles en sont signor del tot. Oste ceste traïson d'Egipte. Ha! se tu savoies comme Photin a le cuer plain d'orgoil, de ce que Pompee a le chief copé. Certes, autretel feront il de toi, si puent; mes fortune te gart. Cleopatra n'eüst gaires amoloi [*one or two words missing.*]

Column 4.

res oreilles Cesar, mes sa clere face e sa biauté firent sa proece e sa besoigne. Cesar l'esgarda que qu'ele parloit a lui, si li entra trop l'amor de lui el cuer, si qu'il en fu si corumpuz qu'il la vossit ja tenir en ses braz. Cesar e Tolomé furent el palais, si fu la pais confermee entr'ax par les grans dons que Tolomé li dona. Cleopatra refu d'autre part qui ot sa mercerie desploie por escommonoier Cesar a luxure. Li leus meïsmes estoit covenables a la chose, car li palais estoit si biax e si riches que c'ert uns granz deliz a veor. Li tref estoient toz coverz de plates d'or, li lambruis estoit toz plains d'or e de pierres precieuses, li pavemenz ne fu que [*ms. has ne*] de marbre ne porfire, ne l'en n'i passoit se sor ouiches non e sor carcedoines. La torz e li porches estoient tuit covert en-sement d'olifanz; les portes assiment estoient de trop grant biauté, car li merriens en ert de cedre e de ciprés. Par le palés estoient li lit e le vesselemmente (d'argent) d'or e d'argent. Les coches furent couvertes de samiz, e

de porpres [ms. *has pepres*] e de draps de soie dont le [word missing] estoit trop riche [two lines missing].

[One or more folios missing.]

Column 5.

de divers habiz, li un viel, li autre juene, li un noir comme mor, li autre blanc. Povres garcons i estoient vetuz de boqueranz e de chamelot, li riche de porpres e de samiz e de diaspes e d'autres drap de soie. La furent li escoillié qui n'ont ne barbe ne grenon, e si estoient de grant aage. Cesar s'asist sor une coche, Tolomé d'une part Cleopatra d'autre. Ele estoit la plus bele dame qu'il covenist a querre. Parmi tot ce fu ele encore fardee por plus decevoir Cesar. La signorie d'Egypte ne li plaisoit pas, ainz tendoit encore a estre dame de Rome. Ele fu vestue de lim e de porpre gotee a or. Ele ot entor ses crins e entor son col grant charge de totes les plus precieuses pierres que l'en 'poet trover en la Roge Mer ne aillors. Ele ot a son col un fermail d'or e de james qui tote il enluminoit la gorge e ot unes fre[n]ges de fin or en tor la chevecaille de sa porpre. Li dui chief li descendoient aval le piz en croiz, si que son piz devant en estoit toz enluminez. La centure qu'ele portoit fu d'un [three lines missing].

Column 6.

son dos sor la c(h)oche, car ele ot ostés le [word illegible] d'entor son col por mielz mostrer la faiture de ses espaules e de son cors qu'ele ot assez bien molle. Ele fu longue e droite, grossate la boche e le menton reont, la color fresche e vermoille, mes li farz qu'ele i ot mis enpiroit son afaire. La panne del mantel qu'ele ot vestu fu d'armine, li tessel d'or fin ou il ot .ij. rubiz selez qui valoi-

ent un grant tressor. Tant s'estoit Cleopatra bien paree que bel envial de luxure avoit en le. Quant ele ouvroit ne tant ne quant les levres, li denz li paroient menu e serré plus que uns voires. Bien estoient Cleopatra e Tolomé hors del sens qui mostroient si granz richaces a lor anemis, qui covoiteus estoient e fesoient toz meschiez por avoir. Bien s'en davoient mesler li estrange! En ceste meniere embrasoient Tolomé e Cleopatra lor ostes qui aloient le monde conquerant e destruiant. N'avoit onques Rome [*six lines missing*].

Column 7.

bacins qui toz estoient de cristal. Quant furent assis li vin e li piment furent mis en hanaps de pierres james precieuses e li autre veissel ou li piment e li claré furent, furent coroné par desus de pierres precieuses e d'espices por soé flairier. Il orent divers mes de betes e de volivre savages e d'autres ausiment qui furent porchaciees e par terre e par mer. Les vins orent il tex conme il onques sorent deviser. Cesar ne prisoit rien totes les richaces des terres que l'en li savoit deviser ne qu'il avoit conquises a la conparaison de ce qu'il trova en Egipte. Lors comenca la terre a covoitier en son cuer e a querre achoison coment il poïst guerrier les Egipcians e trere a soi lor grant avoir. *Coment Cesar enqueroit des anciennes choses* [*six lines missing*].

Column 8.

le comenca a aresoner belement e par plaisans paroles, et dit, Sire, vostre aage demostre que vos doiez assez savoir de sen e de mesure, car bien semble[s] home qui sache des secrez as Diex. Or me dites se des vos saut li comencement e la vie des genz de cest païs, e de queles meurs

il sunt e de quex costumes, e des Diex avecques me dites qui sunt entailliez en ces temples. Feites les nos conoistre e nos dites de lor sacrefices. Platons, qui fu granz mestres a Ateinnes, vint en ces païs e aprist acunes choses a noz ancesseurs; vos m'en poez bien acune chose dire, car vos n'eüistes onques mes oste qui plus digne en fust. La renommee de mon gendre ne m'a pas seulement ca amené, mes la votre. Je ai molt oï parler des astronomiens d'Egipte e ge m'en entent d'acunes choses. Endoxes, qui fu bons astronomiens, ne porroit rien amender en mon calendrier que j'ai fait, ou j'ai trové le jor de bixeste e [*six lines missing*].

Column 9.

si se deffendoit a estal si bien que nulz ch'r mielz. Ele ot grant piece geté e navré de cax dehors. Photin, qu'ele tant haoit aloiot enhortant ses anemis de bien faire. Cleopatra le choisi de haut par aventure e li lanca .i. dart trenchant, si la tint el destre flanc de si grant vertu que onques hauberz ne li fu garanz qu'ele ne li parcest res a res des costes, si que li vermelz sans li taint le hauber e la chauce duque a talon. Preterius fu montez sor une tor d'une chambre e comenca pierres a giter e a lancier darz. Il feri si un Egipcien parmi l'oïl qu'i[1] li tresparca duque au haterel. Argus, uns autres qui refu d'um de ces dehors, cheï devant Cesar d'une fenestre qu'il deffendoit. Quant Cesar le vit mort joste lui tot armé, il le leva du pavement e le lanca hors sor celui qui l'avoit feru, par tel vertu qu'il le trebucha si soëf a terre que li cos li pacea en .ij. motiés. Cil estoit niés Achilles. Quant Achilles vit mort son noveul, cuida le senz changier. Lors comenca a trere e a lancier. Il ot osté un arc de la main a un escuier e lessa [*one line missing*].

Column 10.

une fenestre conme ch'r, mes uns autre ch'r se fu mis par aventure encontre le cop si conme il entendoit a lancier. Cil fu atainz el chief qui n'avoit point de hiame, si que li fers qui fu tranchanz li entra dulque el cervel. Il chā es piez Cleopatra. Cil estoit de la table Tolomé. [*The rest of the column is mutilated by a rent cutting the lines approximately in half.*]

Column 11.

car n'estoient pas duiz de chastel essoer ne de donjons assaillir. Il n'i voient ne mangonel ne perriere, n'autre estrament, ainz se conbatoient solement e senz consoil. Tuit estoient espars cax ca .xx. ca .xxx. par chanbres e par soliers qui estoient tenanz au donjon [*rest of column mutilated as above*].

Column 12.

sant a trere a lui e a occirre lor signor, mes ne l'afermons pas por voir, mes espoir il le feïst se li tres grantz besoinz i venist. Molt se deffendirent bien e darriere e devant, mes quant il virent qu'i[l] ne les poent grever en nule meniere, il firent dedenz bones enprises e de brandons e de poiz e sor les maz e sor les establisemenz des nef [sic] li poiz aviva le feu, si que voilles e maz comancarent a ardoir, car li venez fu grantz qui comenca durement a venter. Li feus qui ne fu pas aparceüz aviva si en petit d'eure qu'i[l] comenca trop durement les nef [sic] a damagier, si que en poi d'eure furent presque totes arses e comencerent a afondre en la mer. De la batelerie qui i estoit, qui sot noer e qui pot si en eschapa. Cil qui la peusanteur del fer efondra najerent e alarent aval, ne

li feus ne li donna pas nuisement as nef [sic] solement, ainz le porta li venz as mesons qui estoient voisines de la rive, si qu'il esprist si durement par la force del vent qu'il portoit les tisonz toz ardanz d'une maison en autre autresi conme foudre qui seut corre par l'air tant que la cité d'Alexandre [*a line and a half missing*].

Column 13.

Ceste chose retraits auques ces de l'essaut qui par devers terre estoit. Car li un entendoient a trere lor compaignons de l'eve, li autre a rescorre le feu. Quant li assauz fu remés por entendre au feu, li jors se trest vers le vespre. Li Egipcien entendirent au feu despecier. Cesar, conme il vit son point, ne fu pas endormiz, car endementres qu'il entendoient au feu e la nuiz fu un poi obscure, il e li suen e Tolomé, qu'i[l] ne volt pas lassier apres soi ne Cleopatra, descendirent au palais par une volte e par .i. postiz repost, si trovarent ilec les nef [sic] apareillies e entrèrent enz, e se nagerent duque a la tor, qui estoit assez pres d'ilec, qui Pharus ot non, ou Cleopatra ot esté en prison. Cil qui gardoient la tor ovrirent les portes si receurent laenz Cesar e sa gent (e) par le comandement le roi, qui estoit avec ax. Li rois faisoit semblant d'amor e de loialté as Romains por la criemme de sa teste, car il ot paor que Cesar ne li trenchast s'il parçeüst nul barat. Quant il furent laienz plus furent a seür que el pa [*four lines missing*].

Column 14.

ceanz de la mer. Ore l'avoit l'en fait un pont qui aloiet parmi l'iaue de cele tor dusque as murs d'Alixandre. Li ponz estoit larges e forz de carriaz tailliez e bien liez a ciment e a plon. Une grant arche i ot ou il ot un pont

levez de fust que l'en poet fermer a bones chaenes de fer de la tor. Lors quant il fu levez cil de laienz furent trop a seür, car il avoient armes e viandes a grant plenté. La force del pont lor aidait, car il po[oi]ent par terre nuire a lor enemis par le pont e par iaue par la navie. Li conostable Cesar, qui s'estoient espandu par Egipte por pre[n]dre feauté des chestiax e des viles oïrent dire que cil d'Alixandre, Photins e Achilles, avoient assis Cesar, si s'assemblerent de totes parz por venir secorre le duc. Antoinnes i vient o tot .v.c. ch'rs. Photins e Achilles avoient assis la tor par terre e par mer, mes il n'i exploitoient riens. Tote jor doient a Cesar qu'il se rendist, mes ne les (d)oït point. Un jor estoient hors issu Photins e Achilles e cil d'Alixandre por *[four lines missing]*.

[Columns 15 and 16 in large part illegible.]

H. A. TODD.

XXIII.—*MAGNIFICENCIA ECCLESIE.*

This curious product of mediævalism, translated from some Latin treatise by an unknown hand in the latter half of the fifteenth century, carries symbolism to its last stage. It is interesting as showing how the preachers in the abbeys and cathedrals of England found, on occasion, "sermons in stones." It would seem as if Longfellow must have read this poem; for a part of his *Golden Legend*, the close of Friar Cuthbert's sermon, is an accurate reproduction of the spirit of this piece.

"And above it the great cross-beam of wood
Representeth the Holy Rood
Upon which, like the bell, our hopes are hung;
And the wheel, wherewith it is swayed and rung,
Is the mind of man, that round and round
Sways, and maketh the tongue to sound!
And the rope, with its twisted cordage three,
Denoteth the Scriptural Trinity
Of Morals, and Symbols, and History,
And the upward and downward motion show
That we touch upon matters high and low,
And the constant change and transmutation
Of action and of contemplation,
Downward, the Scripture brought from on high;
Upward, exalted again to the sky.
Downward, the literal interpretation,
Upward, the Vision and Mystery!"

The Trinity College ms. R. 3. 21, from which the poem is taken, is fully described in the second volume of Prevost James's *Catalogue of the Western MSS. in Trinity College*. It dates from the reign of Edward IV. Among its earliest owners was Roger Thorney, a mercer of London and friend of Wynkyn de Worde. It may be surmised that the poem was written not far from the vicinity of

the Westminster printing shop. John Stow, who owned the ms. in 1598, ascribed the poem to Lydgate in his last of the Monk's writings, printed on the last leaf of Stow's *Chaucer*. He was followed in this error by Joseph Ritson, in his *Bibliographia Literaria* (1802). There is no evidence whatever for this theory, and the poem is far too uncouth and irregular ever to have been penned by Lydgate.¹

The poem, miserably deficient in a literary sense, is yet of value in letting us look for a moment at a fifteenth-century church through a fifteenth-century lens.

Trinity ms. R. 3. 21.

f. 285 a

Hic sequitur paruus tractatus compendiose in Anglicis translatus de magnificencia ecclesie.

Audi Israel. Deus tuus vnus est. Ipsum adorabis & illi soli seruies. Non assumes nomen dei tui in uanum Sicut primum preceptum est quod pertinet ad patrem. Ita ista ad filium. Obserua diem sabbati id est expecta requiem per bonitatem dei. id est per spiritum sanctum.

Emperour of all emperours omnipotent
 Preserue þys empyre in all prosperite
 Rex Regum oure Reame & our regent
 Rule & redresse in ryght & equyte
 O crystyn soule here what ys seyde to the
 Haue oon god in worship of whom þou toke creacion
 ffader & son & holy gost þat blessyd trinite
 And hym oonly serue with dew gratulacion

Hys name in nowyse þou shalt take in veyne
 þat ys þou shalt nat swere but hit be in ryght
 lyche as þe furst precept beforne specfyed pleyne

¹ See *The Lydgate Canon*, p. xxxvi (Philological Soc. Transactions, March, 1908), for rhyme-tests.

perteynep to þe fader ryght so þys Iplyght
 perteynep to þe son of idemptical myght
 The 1j^{de} in trinite god & man verryly
 Who þat beleueþ þe son of god ys only man & nat god bryght
 He worshippeþ hym nat / but takeþ hys name veynly

Thow shalt halow þe sabat þat ys þe holy day
 Whyche longeþ to þe 11j^{de} person þe same god in substance
 ffrom seruile werk þou shalt absteyne þe I say
 And in goodnes of þe holygost dresse þy remembraunce
 These oper vij . preceptes with all þeyre circumstaunce
 Were long to declare þerfore with your pacience
 Because we take in þe chirche feyþe & creaunce
 We purpose to speke of hyr magnificence

Souereynes þe grounde of our processe ys thys
 To shew yow why þe chyrche ys magnifyed
 And of sondry þynges in hit what þe menyng ys
 As porche churche & chauncell as shalbe dyscryuyd
 Iles toures pylers walles & wyndowes wyde
 With oper particuler þynges all we wyll expresse
 What yche of hem signifieþ yef ye wyll abyde
 We purpose to preue in compendious processe

Thys erpely chyrche in whyche þe pepyl dayly
 ys congregate oonly to worshyp of spyrites heuynly
¹ Construct of quyk stones apostles & martyrs gloryos
Hic est domus DOMINI frequenter edificata þan þus
 Thys churche here ys clepyd *Ecclesia militans*
 ffor hyt ys cuer werryng ayenst þe vycyous
¹ The churche aboue ys clepyd *Ecclesia triumphans*
 Betokeneþ þe celestiaþ churche of spirites heuynly

¹ Opposite these lines the scribe writes "a." Reconstruct the lines as follows 1 2 8 3 4 5 6 7. Line 2 should end in some word like "vertuous." The scribe erred through confusion of the "of spirites," occurring in two separate lines.

Lyche as out of þe ryght syde of Adam
 Oure moder Eve was make & he slepyng
 Ryght so þe churche of whyche we take crystyndam
 Out of crystes ryght syde toke forme in hys dying
 Whereout ran flowyng . ij . lycours dystyllyng
 Precyous blood & watyr for oure redempcion
 Whyche sygnify . ij . sacramentes our most helfull wasshyng
 Baptym & Eukaryst necessary to our saluacion

Than syrs to meue yow þe churche to magnify
 ffurst ye shall consydere in your mynde expresse
 Worship & reuerence to þe fadyr almyghty
 longeþ of ryght with verrey dew mekenesse
 Whyche in þe chyrche of hys gret bounteuosnesse
 Abydeþ oure commyng & ys dayly there present
 Then commyng to churche deuoutly do your besynesse
 Mow ye best fulfyl þe furst commaundment

fol. 285 b

And eke þe second for hit ys most conuenient
 In chyrche where god & man ys verryly in substaunce
 To restrayne your langage & be sad & silent
 No iapyng ne ianglyng to cause perturbaunce
 ffor hit ys þe celle of soulys gostly sustynaunce
 Oure hauyn of refute oure helfull port salew
 There ys hys glorios name red of most magnificence
 Where we be hurt for soules socour euer þeder we sew

Kepyng of þe holyday þys ys euyntrew
 Perteyneþ to þe holygost þe þryd in dyuine
 To be kept in þe chyrche hit ys most dew
 ffrom worldly þoughtes in þat place men shuld declyne
 There suld be put prayere & holy þoughtes fyne
 Thys place ys halowyd by our lordes holy presence

Then ought we to worship hit pleynty I termyne
The . viij . sacramentes byn þere mynystred tour expedience

The churche fygyreþ þe deificate *cella vniaria*
As seyþ Salomon & poule *Ad Galathas quarto*
Illa que sursum est Ierusalem libera que est mater nostra
The heuynly churche ys triumphant & for þis reson to
The membres of þat churche haue endyd þere woo
In passions martyrdom & now be in glory
The chyrche here ys werryng agayn our mortall foo
þerfore hit ys mylytant in þys lyfe transitory

Of þys churche Jerom Bede & oþer sey thus
Vrbs beata Ierusalem dicta pacis visio
Que construitur in celis uiuis ex lapidibus
Noua veniens de celo nuptiali thalamo
The mysteryes of þys chyrche ye shall vnderstand loo
Be infinite as vnto our negligence
But now to þe artificiall churche we wyll goo
Of shap & membres shewyng þe experyence

Euery churche lo generally ys made þus
The quere lower þen þe body for þys encheson
Tanto maior est humilia te in omnibus
ffor so þe spirituall men shuld do by reson
The hygher in dignite þe lower in spyryt eche seson
Geuyng ensample to þe degrees temporall
I suppose þys vndyrstondyng to many man is gason
Maior est obediencia quam victima

The churche walles in . iij . quarters set in tryst
The conuersion of Jewes & paynys signify
ffrom . iij . quarters of þe world commyng to cryst
Whyche wallys of square stones byn reryd hygh

Broken & polysshed þe werke to rectify
 That ys to mene stones þat to þese wallys perteyne
 Must be made able by þe handes verryly
 Of þe master werkman þat ys þe preste certeyne

These stonys togedyre conioynyd in þe werke
 Som bere nat / but are bore *vt simplices loose*
 Som bere & are borne *vt medii* seyþ þe clerke
 Som bere & are nat borne / but of cryst *QUI est singulare*
 These stones with mortar to gedyr syment be
 Ryght so þe pepyll of þe churche by heuynly disposicion
 Shuld be conglutinat with loue & charyte
 Then be þey quyk stones mete to þys operacion

The stones þat bere nat be þo of þe batylmentes
 With suche oper garnysschers þat ly on loft hyghest
 So þe simple pore in clene lyfe verrament
 They yeue to þe churche gret beute at leste
 Though þey nat bere þey be necessary & honeste
 The pore þough þey bere but lytyll cost & charge
 Yet be þy quyk stones in þe churche I sey preste
 And with þeyre good prayeres þe feyþe gretly enlarge

f. 286a Som bere & are bore as þus to wyll ye here
Vt medii þat ys to sey in myddes of þe werke
 Whyche be lykenyd to pepyll of gret powere
ffor virtus in medio consistit yef þis text be derke
 lo in þe mene ys vertu / mys take nat your merke
 The furst mow pray þe . i j .^{de} mow pray & do
 þe churche ys nat bore vp all with cost quoth þe clerke
 But with good werkes & deuout prayers also

Som bere & are nat bore but of cryste oonly
 And whyche be þo þe lowest in þe foundacion
 By whyche þe prelates of þe churche I may signify

ffor þey be þe worþyest of þe edificacion
 They bere vp þe churche by ghostly operacion
 Not we theym / but þey vs with holsom doctryne
 Suppose vs & lyft vs out of tribulacion
 And polysshe vs with penance þen be we stones fyne

The toures betoken prechors & prelacy
 Whyche in þe churches defence be ready to refreyn
 All tempestes whyche toures byn bylt hy
Vnde sponsus ad sponsam in cantiois amoris doþ seyn
Collum tuum sicut turris also dauid seyþ pleyn
Edificata cum propugnacula lo a pronosticacion
 The toures of þe chyrche be prelates without feyn
 Toures of oure defence ageyn gostly tribulacion

Vppon þe mastyr toure þat ys seyð þe stepyl
 Comonly þer stondeþ a shaft of altitude
 Or a pynacle whyche to þe vndirstondyng of þe pepyl
 Betokeneþ þe lyuyng of þe prelates to conclude
 Whos mynde vpward to the heuenes celsytude
 Shuld be dyrect & þere also aboue
 A pomell or a crosse with sowde or syment glued
 þeron a wedyrcok with yche wynde doþ moue

The cok betokeneþ þe prechor of goddes worde
 ffor ayenst þe . iij . wyndes he torneþ hys hede
 By whyche wyndes ye shall vnderstonde discorde
 Of . iij . malycyos pepil as heriticius in feyþ dede
 Proud man & couetous & þo þat lecherous lyfe lede
 Whyche . iij . be seyde detestable ouer all þe synnes seuyn
 Ayenst whyche . goddes prechors with opyn mouþe doþ grede
 lyke as þe wedurcok ayenst yche wynde doþe [?]_w^meuyn

The crosse of Iron stondeþ opon a pomell rounde
 In tokenyng þat cryst Jhesus made oure redempcion
 Vppon þe crosse oure gostly enemy to confounde

Amyddes þe worlde as scripture makes mension
 Thys þyng to proclayme þorought euery region
 longeþ to þe curat to stere oure slepy mynde
 ffor to remembre oure blessyd lordes passion
 Whyche apon a crosse wold dy for all mankynde

Whyche prechor ys lykened to a cok take hede
 A Cok soply dyuydyþ þe owres of þe nyght
 And out of slombryng & slepe he clepeþ vs in dede
 And hys crowyng bryngeþ tydynges of day lyght
 And for to make also hys voyce of gretter myght
 With his owne wynges he betep hymself full ryfe
 The mystery of þys whoso vndyrstond hit ryght
 Betokenep lyfe actyf & lyfe contemplatife.

The nyght betokenep þis blynd worldes wrechydnes
 In whyche þe pepylk dayly lyþe slepyng in syn
 The cok I mene þe preste clepeþ vs with besynes
 To ryse out of oure derk slepe & conseleþ vs to wyn
 The lyght euerlastyng kepe þus þy mynde withyn
Ve dormientibus þe scripture seyph pleynly
 Wo be to þe slepar þat vertu cannat begyn
Exurge qui dormis all creatures þou shuld cry

fol. 286 b Ryght as a foule spredeþ vppon her nest syttyng
 Whyche vnder her wynges her byrdes doþ cure
 Ryght so oure modyr holy churche presentep a figure
 Norysshying her chylde vnder þe couerture
 Of her wynges þat ys to sey þe ylys I sure
 ffor vnder þe modyrs wynges þe chylde is kept clos
 ffrom perysshying & perell þan pray we with scrypture
Sub umbra alarum tuarum protege nos.

The wyndowes be glased for defence of wynde & Rayn
 In whyche þer be portrayed storyes auctorized

That betokenep þe deuyne scripture as doctors seyn
 Whyche ys gret defence where hit ys exercysyd
 Ayenst erroneous wyndes with heresyas supprysyd
 Also as þe bryght son yeueþ orient lyght
 Thorough þe glasse to þe chyrche ryght so hit ys deuysyd
 That þe storyes of scripture make þe consciens bryght

The wyndows by wydere withyn þan without
 In tokyn þat þe mysterious science of scripture
 Passeþ þe litterall sense & ryght so out of dout
 The prelates of churche in vndyrstondyng pure
 Passe þe lay pepyl & as clowdes I yow sure
 Ben seen fleyng *quasi columbe ad fenestras*
 These wyndows betokyn . v . wyttes in eche creature
 Openyng in ward þe redyer to reccue grace

They be variaunt without *ne vanitates hauriant*
 That ys þat no vyce entere nor no corrupcion
 Then to receue grace þey ought nat to be scant
 But opyn inwarde redy to take gostly instruccion
Hostium christus est þan with swetnes & deuocion
 Entryng þe churche þynke þe dore seyþ þe gospell
 Ye cryst hymself þys ys hys own mocion
 I am þe dore by whyche ye enter þe churche perpetuell

The pylers of þe chyrche byn þe doctours veryly
 Whyche myghtyly bere hit vp with holy doctryne
 Augustyne & Ambrose holy Jerom & Gregory
 As þe foure euangelystes bere vp þe trone dyuyne
 Ryght so þey se þe chyrche & be as syluer fyne
Vt in Canticis canticorum ye may haue euydence
Columpnas fecit argenteas þat as syluer shyne
 ffor in þo songes of þe soule ys songyn gret reuerence

Veni columba mea vnto my tabernacle
Columpna argenteas þere shynyng shalt þou se
Aureum reclinatorium be in myn habitacle
 Curyosly contryuyd embrawd with charyte
Assensum purpureum for pure humylyte
 ffor þe ys redy rayed in my regalibus
 lo for mannys soule ys ordeynyd þys dignite
 Now whyche be þe reclinatoryes we shall sone discus

The seetys in þe churche where men rest in to pray
 Tho be þe reclinatoryes whyche setys signyfy
 The holy contemplacion of men & wemen I say
 Whyche in holy þoughtes in her seetes byn besy
 In whyche pepyll oure lord haþ hys sete verryly
 And resten in þeyre soules with full gret plesaunce
 Those be þe goldyn seetes occupyed with þynges heuynly
 lo of þe reclinatoryes þys ys þe signifiaunce

The degrees ascendyng vnto þe autere
 Betokenen apostles & martyrs . I . vndyrtake
 Whyche forto shede þer blood made no dangere
 But patiently suffred to dy for crystes sake
 þys ys *ascensum purpureum* þat Salomon let make
 Of Cedre trees of lyban a Royall mansion
 And cryste makeþ hys house of þe purest to ransake
 Of holy seyntes puryd by peynfull passion

fol. 287 a The auter in hit sylf betokenen cryst Jhesus
 Vppon whyche dayly þe preste makeþ oblacion
 To þe fadyr in heuen þerfore þe prest seyth þus
PER christum DOMINUM nostrum at þe ende of his orison
 The multitude of mysteryes short in conclusion
 That may be ascryuyd to þe chyrches excellence
 Were impossible for oon clerke in myn opinion
 In all hys lyfe to shew to your intelligence

Wherefore brefely concludyng oure purpos
 Why we mene þys mater I wyll hit expresse
 lo þat eche man shuld þynke hymself on of þose
 To do þe churche reuerence with all mekenesse
 þys ys nat all ment by þe stonewerk in soþnesse
 But by þe crystyn pepyl in baptym confirmat
 ffor ryche & pore when deþe hem shall dystresse
 But he be a quyk stone he ys a Renegat

That ys a forsakere of feyþe & of trew beleue
 Of whyche þer be to many yef men shuld hit say
 Yef feyþe were in vs stedfast noþyng shuld myscheue
 Sysme ne fygaldry ne falshode in no way
 Shuld reygne among þe pepyl þus day by day
 To abhominable yef men wold take hede
Eiciens de templo cryst our lord drof no nay
 Thre pepyl þat gretly defoule þe churche in dede

Tho were proud men lecherous & couetous
 Whyche in þe heuynly chyrche haue no dwellyng place
 That ought we curates to loke well about vs
 These . iij . cursyd wedys out of þe chyrche to race
 þe prophet Daud *PsALMO LXXX^{mo} . vj^o .* has
Ciuitas dei gloriosa dicta sunt de te
 Thys *Ciuitas interpretatur ciuium vnitas*
 þe churche membres shuld be oon in feyþe & charyte

Pryde doutlese of þe churche membre ys non
 Remembre why lucifere fell from heuyn down
 þan who þat ys mysponde may be no quyk ston
 He must be þrow downe þan þys ys þe conclusion
 What pride now regnep & inordinat abusyon
 To abhominable to here yef ye wold vndyrstond
 And moste among þe pore þat haue no possession
 Syþ hit began was neuer wele comen in þys lond

The . iij^{de} ys lechery whyche cryst draue out also
 An vnclene pale stone in paldnes abydyng
 Of whyche stones whylom were founded chyrches two
Soddoma Gomor þat to hell were slydyng
 ffor febyll foundation hit gaynep nat þe gydyng
Debile fundamentum fallit opus as I rede
 These stones from þe werke we must by dyuydyng
 Or þey woll drow down all þys ys forto drede

The couetous also auoydyd must be nede
 In whyche be . viij . propertees full perylous I preue
 As þeft Rauen vsury lying & falshede
 Sacrylege & simony þat dop þe toures meue
 And where þe mures be meuyng þe werk must myscheue
 The brennyng of þis ston dyssolueþ þe syment
 That ys loue & charyte þen trustly me beleue
 Suche stones in þe churche be full inconuenient

Broþer þe gouernaunce of þe churche I assygne yow forþy
 That ye suffer þerin no surfet nor superfluyte
 Therwhyles I wyll go in to þe library
 To serche & stody in bokes of auctoryte
 Eftsones to shew þe pepyll þe gret dignite
 That longeþ to þe churche & liberaþ fraunchyse
 Whyles ye pray I woll rede storyes of antiquite
 And I wyll pray whyle ye rede eftsone in lyke wyse

Explicit.

HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN.

XXIV.—A DEFINITION OF *PETRARCHISMO*.

While the origin, sources, and evolution of the drama of the sixteenth century have been elaborately studied, curiously enough the non-dramatic literature of the period has suffered from comparative neglect. Monographs on single authors, studies on English literature alone, in many cases have erred thru false perspective. Thus, altho the time is not yet ripe for the general history of the sonnet, desired by M. Vaganay,¹ it may be profitable briefly to consider English literature, in one of its phases, in relation to the great movement of which it was a part.

At the opening of the sixteenth century the English language was in a state of transition. Two important modifications were taking place; first, the final *e* was no longer pronounced; and, secondly, the *en* was no longer used for the plurals of verbs. Ellis² dates the loss of the first from the middle of the preceding century. Professor Skeat³ places it even earlier: "About A. D. 1400 the sound of final *e*, already lost in the north, was lost in the midland dialect also." Consequently Professor Saintsbury⁴ concludes: "the poetry was in a pitiable state of eclipse and disorganization, and the language was still in a process of formation." It is this condition which explains Ascham's petulance:⁵ "As for ye Latin or greke tonge, euery thing is so excellently done in them, that none can do better: In the Englysh tonge on the contrary,

¹ Hugues Vaganay, *Le Sonnet en Italie et en France*, Fasc. II, p. xvi.

² Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, 1, 405.

³ Skeat, *Principles of English Etymology*, First Series, p. 331.

⁴ Saintsbury, *The Earlier Renaissance*, p. 15.

⁵ Ascham, *Toxophilus*, Arber's reprint, p. 18.

euery thinge in a maner so meanly, both for the matter and the handelynge, that no man can do worse."

This change in the language especially affected poetry. In 1400 England had had one writer who was both a great poet and a great master of verse-technique. In 1500 his poems were no longer available as models. In Professor Lounsbury's ¹ phrasing: "The dropping of this one vowel was a main cause of the ruin that overtook the metre. The forgetfulness of the fact that it had once been sounded was the chief reason why for so long a period the measure failed to be restored." Direct evidence to this effect is given by Skelton:²

"In Chaucer I am sped,
His tales I have red :
His mater is delectable,
Solacious, and commendable ; . . .
At those dayes moch commended,
And now men wold haue amended
His Englysh, whereat they barke,
And mar all they warke."

That Chaucer's matter was "delectable" is shown by the eight ³ editions before 1600, and by innumerable references to his tales; that his poetry is lost is shown equally by the omission of his name in such a poem as Drayton's ⁴ "To Himself and the Harp." Indirectly, the same point is proved by such poems as the "Court of Love." Professor Skeat ⁵ has shown definitely, I think, that they are consciously archaic experiments, attempting to follow Chaucer in a non-Chaucerian age and in a non-Chaucerian language. As such, they were foredoomed to failure.

¹ Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, I, 251.

² Skelton, ed. Dyce, I, 88.

³ Lounsbury, *Chaucer*, I, 265.

⁴ Drayton's Odes, *English Garner*, p. 529.

⁵ Skeat, *Supplementary Volume to Chaucer*, p. 409.

The failure was the more obvious since the court-life demanded poetry. As Henry the Seventh was practically an usurper, the first two Tudors had a *parvenue* court; the great ambition of both father and son was to establish their dynasty. This ambition, to be considered in the concert of Europe, explains so many of Henry the Eighth's political extravagances, his gorgeousness and love of display. But like every *nouveau riche*, he desired the environment of culture. For this, such poetry as that of Skelton, vigorous tho it was, was unsuited. For such a court, the Skeltonian poem failed.

The natural solution was to turn to the classics. Humanism was at the flow, the great Latin and Greek poets were accessible thru such publications as the Aldine imprints, and to a certain number of writers, there the way seemed to lie. It is this which in an analogous situation is advocated by Du Bellay, and the project is so plausible that in England for a hundred years it was attempted. All of us know Harvey's arguments, and all of us know Stanyhurst's failure. Yet, remembering Mr. Robert Bridges, remembering Kingsley, and Clough, and Longfellow, and Swinburne, it is not fair to denominate this solution a failure. But for that century, at least, it was not a success. The Augustan court differed too radically from 16th century England to make adaptation easy, and the principle of Latin prosody, quantity, is too unlike the accentual system of English verse to be easily acclimatized. Consequently, in spite of numerous attempts, the humanistic impulse was not the main factor in Tudor poetry.

After this, but one other way lay open—to seek models in modern literatures. Of these, the Italian most naturally suggested itself, since the Cinquecento was the flour-

ishing time of the Italian Renaissance in politics, art, and literature. Nor was the opportunity lacking. One of the concomitants of this provincial feeling on the part of the English people was an interest in and a respect for Italian. Ascham¹ tells us that Italian translations were sold in every bookshop in London, that² "men have in more reverence the triumphs of Petrarch, than the Genesis of Moses." So far is this the case that it is a safe statement that he who does not know the literature of the Cinquecento does not, cannot, know the English literature of the sixteenth century.

The predominant characteristic of this Italian literature is its extreme intellectualism. This was due to the social conditions in the innumerable little courts. Like the French salons of the eighteenth century, they developed a type of mind, clever rather than deep, witty rather than profound. The *Cortegiano* of Castiglione thus resembles in tone the Letters of Lord Chesterfield. One finds a mass of *indovinelli*, poems if they may be called such, where the trick consists in meaning one thing while saying another, *I Motti* of Bembo, for example, or any of the *capitoli*, or the *Vendemmiatore* of Tansillo. A comment of Doni³ also illustrates this: "I once saw a hundred sonnets of Cornazzano, all in praise of eyes,—by my faith, it is a great thing to make so many rimes over a single object. Wherefore, for certain writing in manuscript and these works printed, he should be put among the number of gallant spirits of his age." The academies which sprang up in every principal city in Italy—Doni⁴ gives a list of seventeen—were really men-

¹ Ascham, *Scholemaster*, Arber's reprint, p. 79.

² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

³ Doni, *La Libreria*, In Vinegia, 1557, p. 24.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 277.

tal gymnasiums. Any paradox that gave a play to the mental faculties was discussed. The Intronati of Siena,¹ for example, argue that he that loves not should be loved more than he that loves, that it is more harmful to do an injury than to receive it, that a woman should prefer an ugly man to a handsome one, etc. Lando, having written his *Paradossi*, promptly writes his *Confutazione*. It is merely an intellectual game.

With this trait of the literature must be considered a characteristic of the Italian life, its cynical immorality. To one who has read the *novelle*, the *Priapea* of Franco, the *Ragionamenti* of Aretino, the satires of Pietro Nelli, or the *Capitoli* of Berni, no further comment is necessary. To one familiar with the histories of the Italian families, the lives and crimes of the Borgia, Baglioni, d'Este, no more need be said. Yet, however unpleasant it is to discuss, it must never be forgotten that while the superstructure was platonic idealism, the foundation was cynical immorality.

Society in such a condition took upon itself to imitate the Petrarch of the *Canzoniere*. Actually the real and the ideal were poles apart. Whereas on the one side all conception of love had degenerated into gross sensuality,² on the other was upheld a love almost entirely of the spirit. For twenty years during the life of Laura and for ten years after her death, according to the story of the *Rime*, Petrarch humbly besought the favor of a lady, modest, chaste, and beautiful. This situation is set forth with minute analysis, in three hundred and seventeen sonnets, twenty-nine *canzoni*, nine *sestine*, seven *ballate*, and four *madrigali*.³ The series is divided into two parts.

¹ *Dieci Paradosse degli Academici Intronati da Siena*, Milano, 1564.

² Cf. Graf, *Attraverso il Cinquecento*, Torino, 1888, p. 20.

³ This numeration follows Mestica's edition.

Whereas in the first part there are slight indications that the love is fleshly, in the second the love is entirely that of the spirit.

Obviously, imitations of Petrarch may follow along several general lines. The form of the two parts may be copied, or only the use of sonnets, varied by other lyrical verse-forms; or the substance may be copied without a strict adherence to the forms. For our purpose, however, the imitations may be grouped into two main classes: First, Petrarchism, where the author, carried away by his admiration, unconsciously and not servilely copies his master, or honestly translates him. In English, Wyatt is an example. Secondly, *Petrarchismo*, a foreign manner for which I retain the foreign name, an insincere literary fashion, where Petrarch figures only as the first of the type. Examples of this are any of the Elizabethan sonneteers. Only this last need concern us now—*Petrarchismo*. It is Graf, I think, who defines it as “art for art’s sake.” M. Piéri¹ explains it thus: “*Petrarchismo* is the art of treating cleverly and wittily matters of the heart, of composing love-poems without the emotion in the soul, of feigning passion for an imaginary mistress, and of singing a fiction of amorous intrigue, whose phases and whose stages are fixed, and, as it were, established by an immovable tradition. To succeed in this type our sixteenth-century poets needed only a little learning and imagination, a great deal of memory, and a certain ability in the art of composition.” As Cardinal Bembo was the great exemplar, the fashion is sometimes called *Bembismo*. But to make the matter still more complex, Angelo di Costanzo reacted, harked back to the Quattrocentisti, and developed the epigrammatic sonnet. Thus, from one

¹ Marius Piéri, *Pétrarque et Ronsard*, 1896, p. 268.

original Petrarch, there sprang, in the Cinquecento, a number of varying forms, all of them equally insincere.

But this insincerity can be pushed back, even to Petrarch himself. At Arqua, as an old man, he rewrote his poems, altering lines; so that the *Canzoniere* is rather a work of art than a record of objective fact. Finzi¹ thus summarizes the condition: "Commenced, one may say, with the ardor of a lover, continued with minute care through more than ten lusters, elaborated, corrected, arranged with the feeling of an artist, the *Canzoniere* is not a collection of historic and psychologic documents on the love of Petrarch for Laura. It is an elaboration, artistic, slow, and manifold, of the motive which dominated poetry for more than a century in Provence and Italy. On this *general* motive of art, the poet has grafted the *personal* motive of his love for Laura, melting the two elements into a work which, on account of its perfection, remains one and indivisible, and which cannot be discomposed so that they appear sharply distinct."

In the Cinquecento the natural effect of this conception was to divorce literature from life. Subject-matter, treatment, and vocabulary, all become purely conventional. The point is so important that I shall cite instances. Bembo himself writes a series of aspiring, idealizing sonnets to Morosina, who was known to be his mistress and the mother of his children. Laura Battiferra follows the fashion in addressing the beloved lady, notwithstanding the limitation of her sex, and the incumbrance of a husband. Ariosto ends a typically conventional sonnet by remarking frankly:² "All this is wonderful, truly.

¹ Guiseppe Finzi, *Pétrarque, Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*, Paris, 1906, p. 162.

² Ariosto, *Opere Minori*, I, sonnet XXII.

Tutto è mirabil certo. Nondimeno
Non starò ch'io non dica arditamente,
Che piu mirabil molto è la mia fede.

Nevertheless I am not sure that I do not say emphatically that much more wonderful is my faith." Sperone Speroni compiled a dictionary of Petrarch's phrases, in order that he might be certain to apply the correct adjective to the given noun. Tullia d'Aragona is both the author of and interlocutor in the *Dialogo della Infinità di Amore*¹ wherein is upheld the principle that "honest love, which is peculiar to noble men, those who have gentle and virtuous souls, whether they be rich or poor, is not born in desire as is the other, but in the reason, and has for its principal end to transform itself into the beloved object, with the hope that she be likewise transformed into him, so that from two they become one, or four; of this transformation have sung so many times and so pleasantly, thus Messer Francesco Petrarca, thus the Right Reverend Cardinal Bembo; as one cannot experience it except spiritually, hence is it that in such loves no sentiments have place except the spiritual, that is, seeing, hearing, and still more, as being more spiritual, the imagination." And yet historically it is a fact that Tullia d'Aragona was a common prostitute, listed in the Tariff of Venice! Literary convention versus the actual fact!

So much for external evidence. Internal evidence tells the same tale. Necessarily one becomes suspicious when poet after poet bewails the same experience, in almost

¹ *Della Infinità Di Amore di Tullia d'Aragona*. Biblioteca Rara, XXIX, p. 52. "L'amore onesto, il quale è proprio degli uomini nobili, cioè che hanno l'animo gentile, e virtuoso, qualunque essi siano o poveri, o ricchi, non è generato nel disiderio, come l'altro, ma dalla ragione, e ha per suo fine principale il trasformarsi nella cosa amata con disiderio che ella si trasformi in lui, tal che di due diventino un solo, o quattro; della qual trasformazione hanno favellato tante volte, e così leggiadramente sì messer Francesco Petrarca, sì il reverendissimo cardinal Bembo; la quale perchè non si può fare se non spiritalmente, quindi è che in cotale amore non hanno luogo principalmente se non i sentimenti spiritali: ciò è il vedere, e l'udire, e più assai, come più spiritale, la fantasia."

identical terms, concerning ladies who differ only in their names. Consequently there are great types of sonnets, the "galley" sonnet, the cumulative sonnet, the negative sonnet, the sonnet comparing the lady to gems, to flowers,—all using the same conceits, the same metaphors, the same allegories. Obviously it is a literary manner, without objectivity.

This confused mass was passed on to England. Wyatt, traveling in Italy in 1526, and finding there similar court-life, brought back court-poetry. Wyatt not only translated from Petrarch, but also took a sonnet from Sannazaro.¹ Then, reënforced by Surrey, *Petrarchismo* started on its long career. As, however, the arrival of *Petrarchismo* in England antedated its arrival in France,² the authors of Tottel were subject to no French influence in their sonnets.

But this is not the case with the writers of the time of Elizabeth. The minority of Edward, and the turbulent reign of Mary, had so retarded the English development that *Petrarchismo* in the Pléiade was flourishing before the Elizabethans, who naturally turned to the nearest sources. But the Pléiade combined *Petrarchismo* with classical studies. The French, then, presents a new modification of the type. The old fidelity to one mistress is denied by the very titles; Ronsard has cycles to Marie and to Hélène. Platonism becomes more normal. De Baif is at times sensual. De Magny and Du Bellay use the sonnet form for elegies. They strike a new note.

But the two stages of sonneteering in England are alike in one particular, namely, that in neither case are the sonnets to be taken literally as a statement of objective

¹ Berdan, *Modern Language Notes*, February, 1908.

² Berdan, *Modern Language Review*, January, 1909.

fact, without careful study of external evidence. Historians have cited them as proofs, and the critics have proved by citing the historians, and the vicious circle rolls on. But when the sonnets are taken collectively, the fact is surely obvious. The greatest blow to the objective reality of these sonnet-cycles was Mr. Sidney Lee's publication of the Elizabethan cycles in one volume. Again it is but fair to acknowledge that even the prototype Laura is but a shadowy figure, suggested rather than described, her most marked characteristic being her golden hair. Yet, when of the sixteen cycles printed by Mr. Lee, thirteen state definitely that the hair of the lady is golden¹—the other three are simply non-committal—there is a surprising agreement either in poetic taste or in poetic conventionality. When, in addition, the same sonnet-forms appear, as in the Italian and French, it seems unnecessary to speculate on the identity of the lady, until her existence be proved.

Actually each sonnet presents an individual problem. As M. Vaganay² estimates at about two hundred thousand

¹ *Elizabethan Sonnets*, Sidney Lee, New York, n. d.

Sidney. "Gold is the covering of that stately place." Son. ix.

Daniel. "These amber locks are those same nets, my Dear." Son. vi.

Barnes. "In goldy locks." Son. xix.

Lodge. "And gold more pure than gold doth gild thy hair." Son. xvii.

Fletcher. "When as her hair (more worth, more pale, than gold)." Son. xxx.

Constable. "The crest was waves of gold." Son. x.

Daniel. "When Winter snows upon thy golden hairs." Son. xxxvii.

Anon. "The golden ceiling of thy brow's rich frame." Canz. 17.

Spenser. "If gold, her locks are finest gold on ground." Son. xv.

Griffin. "My lady's hair is threads of beaten gold." Son. xxxii.

R. L. "Her hair exceeds gold forced in smallest wire." Son. iii.

Smith. "Remembering her locks, of which the yellow hue
Made blush the beauties of the curled wire." Son. ix.

Tofte. "Then give me of thy hairs! which golden be." Pt. 1, xii.

² *Op. cit.*, Fasc. II, p. ix.

the number of sonnets composed between 1530 and 1565, no one knows or can remember the literature. There are then five possibilities:

First. The sonnet may be original. Sidney's "Whether the Turkish moon new minded be" and Spenser's "Most happy letters! framed by skillful trade" are localized by their allusions.

Second. It may be a direct translation of Petrarch. Lodge's twenty-fifth sonnet has thus been identified by Mr. Lee.

Third. It may be a mosaic of Petrarchan phrases. Professor Koepfel¹ has shown this to be the case with Sidney. Drayton's sixteenth sonnet is thus reminiscent of two of Petrarch's.

Fourth. It may be a direct translation or modification of an Italian imitator of Petrarch. Lodge's "Not causeless were you christened, gentle flowers" is so direct a translation from Ariosto that it has nothing original except the concluding couplet. Comically enough, as Lodge could not work in the name of the first flower, it is incomprehensible without a knowledge of the Italian. Spenser's "My love is like to ice, and I to fire" follows in the octave Cazza's "Se la mia donna è tutta neve, e ghiaccio." Fletcher's "A painter drew the image of a boy" simply takes the conceit of the sonnet attributed variously to Orcagna and to Burchiello.

Fifth. It may be taken from the French Petrarchists. Here Mr. Lee and Professor Kastner have done notable work.

But although thus deprived of their biographical rôle, these sonnets mark an important stage in our literature.

¹ Koepfel, E., *Studien zur Geschichte des englischen Petrarchismus, Romanische Forschungen*, 5.

From the rude and halting verse of Stephen Hawes, from the powerful doggerel of Skelton, it is a far cry to the mastery of language of Marlowe, Shakespeare, and the Spenser of the *Faerie Queene*. This transition is marked by the sonnets. The form is notoriously difficult, requiring all the resources of the language. Poor as some of these sonnets are, they are yet interesting as representing the trial stages of the art. Spenser's *Amoretti* are frigid and artificial, but without them he could never have attained the mastery of the Spenserian stanza. M. Michiels' ¹ summary of the Pléiade is true here: "its true service is the advance which it made in the language and in versification; the style became more rich, the phrase more abundant, the period more numerous, the meter more varied." Thus whereas the 'prentice pieces of the modern poet never appear, those of the sixteenth century are not only preserved, but a fictitious biographical value is placed upon them. But they were not written to deceive. Watson labels his sources quite carefully. In general, it was assumed that every cultivated reader would recognize the translation from Desportes, Ronsard, or Ariosto. It is the misfortune of that age, and the double misfortune of our present-day studies, that we have forgotten the once admired originals. Consequently we treat these trifles too seriously, deduce from them facts that are untrue, use heavy words, such as plagiarism and theft, when the sixteenth-century poet was only doing his best to improve both himself and his mother tongue. *Petrarchismo* was but a literary fashion, and the Elizabethan sonnet-cycle but a necessary stage in the progress to the greatness of the Elizabethan age.

JOHN M. BERDAN.

¹ Alfred Michiels, *Oeuvres de Desportes*, 1858, p. xcii.

XXV.—SOURCE AND ANALOGUES OF *HOW A
MAN MAY CHOOSE A GOOD WIFE
FROM A BAD.*

From Langbaine's time it has been usual to consider the play *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad* as drawn directly from Cinthio's *Hecatommithi*, book III, novel 5. But Riche had translated this novel¹ and made it the sixth history of his *Farewell to Military Profession* some years before the drama appeared, and, as Riche's translation was no doubt easily accessible, the author of the play is more likely to have used his version than the Italian. It would be hard to decide which is the immediate source, however, for the double reason that Riche usually follows his original almost phrase by phrase, occasionally enlarging a compressed Italian expression into what amounts to an explanation or illustration of the original, and that, where the author of *How a Man May Choose* has followed his source closely, he is so far from copying the language that

¹ Koepfel, *Studien zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle*, pp. 48, 49. Koepfel (p. 98) also considers the story in Greene's *Penelope's Web* called "Penelope's Tale" an adaptation of this same story of Cinthio. Greene's *Never too Late* and the verse tale *How a Marchande dyd hys Wyfe Betray* (Hazlitt, *Early Popular Poetry*, vol. I) likewise deal with the ungrateful courtesan who has been preferred to the patient wife, but neither is closely related to the Cinthio story with its addition of the sleeping-potion motive. *How a Marchande dyd hys Wyfe Betray* was apparently better known under the title *A Pennyworth of Wit*. In the story of similar title, *A Groatsworth of Wit*, and in various other pamphlets published as Greene's at the time of his death and purporting to be autobiographical, the treacherous courtesan is frequently treated. On the ground that it may be closely related to *The Bristowe Merchant*, the lost play of Ford and Dekker, Prof. Bang has recently reprinted in his first volume of *John Fordes dramatische Werke* Dekker's *Penny-wise, Pound-foolish* (1631), the first part of which is based on *How a Marchande dyd hys Wyfe Betray*, with hints perhaps from Greene's *Never too Late*.

his phrasing may as well be his own translation as his adaptation of Riche's. But the slight evidence is all in favor of his borrowing from Riche. For instance, where Cinthio reads, "Aseigia . . . indusse un suo drudo a riuelare a parëti di Agata, che il marito auelenata l'hauena,"¹ we find in Riche:

"Wherefore she reveiled his speeches unto a ribalde of hers, such a one as supplied her want of that which Gonsales alone, nor ten suche as he were able to satisfie her withall, and induced hym to appeache hym for that facte. . . . This companion accused Gonsales upon his owne wordes unto the freendes of Agatha," etc.²

This "ribalde" rather than Cinthio's simple "un suo drudo" would likely suggest the character of Brabo in *How a Man May Choose*, servant, paramour, and constant attendant of the courtesan, who protects her from the husband's anger and finally secures his arrest at her command. Of course, however, such a character as Brabo was a familiar attendant of the courtesan on the stage.³

I should ordinarily think that no detailed demonstration of the fact that the author of *How a Man May Choose*

¹ *Hecatommithi*, Venice, 1608, p. 303.

² *Farewell to Military Profession*, Shakespeare Society, p. 172.

³ Pilia-Borsa of *The Jew of Malta*, for example, is very similar to Brabo and may have contributed something to the character, all the more as the story of how the servant of the Jew fell in love at first sight with the courtesan, who desired solely to fleece him, of how he spent money upon her and betrayed his master for her, confessing the murders of his master and himself, and of how he was brought immediately before the judges by the courtesan and her man (III, 1; IV, 4; V, 1), has some minor points similar to *How a Man May Choose* and not found in Riche. But the earliest known edition of *The Jew of Malta* is that of Heywood in 1633, and an acceptance of Fleay's conjecture that Heywood about 1632 added to "the scenes with Bellamira and Pilia Borza" would render it probable that these incidents in *The Jew of Malta* owe something to *How a Man May Choose*.

derived his plot from Cinthio or Riche was called for, especially as he was a minor dramatist writing at a time when there was little effort at originality of plot. But Prof. Schelling, whose opinion is weighty, in his recent *Elizabethan Drama*¹ says of *How a Man May Choose* :

“The source of this story—which seems too obviously a matter of every-day experience to search for at all—has been found in Cinthio and duly recorded. Its atmosphere is, however, wholly English, and to those who retain the slightest faith in the possibility that two very ordinary men may say the obvious without incurring, either of them, the imputation of plagiarism this parallel may be regarded as negligible.”

The claim for an English atmosphere may be admitted if we allow that much of the machinery of the play—the poisoning, the tomb, etc.—reflects the Italian source. For the author of *How a Man May Choose* has placed his scene in London instead of Seville, has expanded the faithful wife into a Patient Grissil, has darkened the villainy of the husband after the manner of the domestic tragedy, has multiplied the characters and changed their names, and has developed characters barely mentioned into full comic types, for which hints may have been gathered from various English sources. For instance, Old Lusam of *How a Man May Choose*, who speaks always as an echo of Old Arthur, reminds one of the man in *Tales and Quicke Answeres* (Hazlitt, LIX) who varies his actions to suit every criticism ; of Blanuel in *An Humorous Day's Mirth*, who responds to compliments with an exact echo ; and of various characters in the drama, like Stephen in *Every Man in his Humour*, who often merely echo their mentors,—though Old Lusam and the justice with his meaningless syllogisms are remarkably fresh comic types.

¹ Vol. I, pp. 331, 332.

In spite of the fact that the general motive of the Cinthio-Riche story and *How a Man May Choose* is obvious and a "matter of every-day experience," as Prof. Schelling says, an outline of the parallels between the two will prove, I think, that the story as the source of the play is hardly "negligible," while the few passages that seem worth citing strengthen the claim of Riche as the immediate source. At any rate, the fact that the author of *How a Man May Choose* follows his source, and at times very closely, not only in his central figures and incidents but often in sentiments and details of characterization, cannot fail to be of interest in an estimate of his drama.¹

Both story and play open with an account of a husband who has grown tired of his beautiful and virtuous wife, and the story lays the foundation for the characterization of these figures in the play. According to Riche, Gonsales, the husband, was "so variable and so unconstant, that he suffered hymself to be ruled wholly by his passions," and "waxing wearie of love, grewe to desire chaunge." Young Arthur, the husband in *How a Man May Choose*, declares that his "ranging pleasures love variety." Both wives are devoted, deaf to the entreaties of their lovers, ready to excuse their husbands' neglect and unfaithfulness. Agatha of Riche's story says that she would not bar Gonsales of "that libertie, whiche either the custome of the corrupted

¹ Among the many additions to Riche's story, one scene of the play is somewhat similar to the kindred *How a Marchande dyd hys Wyfe Betray*. After the courtesan of *How a Man May Choose*, learning that Young Arthur is a criminal, casts him off and seeks his arrest, he meets his neglected wife as he flees from justice, and she proves solicitous for his welfare and safety. In the story, the merchant, in order to test the loyalty of the courtesan on whom he has lavished his wealth to the neglect of his wife, pretends to have lost his property and to be a fugitive from justice. The courtesan drives him from her door, but his wife receives him with joy and is willing to shield him from punishment.

worlde, or the priviledge that men had usurped unto themselves, had given unto them." And Mistress Arthur tells Young Arthur,

"If you delight to change, change when you please,
So that you will not change your love to me."

In both cases the wife's lover forms throughout in his devotion a contrast with the husband, and tests the wife's faithfulness in the extremes of the husband's unfaithfulness. The "scholer of phisicke" in the story is both the wife's lover and the husband's friend and confidant. The author of *How a Man May Choose* has expanded this scholar of physic and his procuress into Young Lusam, the friend and confidant of the husband; Anselm, the wife's lover; and Fuller, Anselm's friend, who is skilled in drugs and who instructs the lover in wooing.

With this situation in the two homes, the courtesan appears on the scene. In each case the husband suddenly conceives a violent passion for her, immediately forms the purpose to make away with his wife, administers in her food a sleeping potion which he supposes to be poison,—the details vary here in the two accounts,—and in an exceedingly short time marries the courtesan.

On the night following the funeral of the wife, the lover visits the tomb. Just as he enters, the wife revives, with the cry, "Where am I?" and expresses her terror and amazement at being in the tomb. Then each lover, in order to urge his claim, stresses his love, his service in reviving the woman, and the husband's treachery and unfaithfulness. The wife checks his words of love, declaring her readiness to put herself under his protection, but swearing, in the words of Agatha,—

"But if your meanyng perchance bee, that the losse of myne honestie should bee the rewarde and hire for your

paines, I dooe beseche you to departe hence out of this tounge, and to leave me here enclosed ; for I had rather dye here, thus buried quicke through the crueltie of my housband, then through any such compassion or pitie to save my life, with the losse of myne honour and good name,"¹

and in the words of Mistress Arthur—

“ So your demand may be no prejudice
To my chaste name, no wrong unto my husband,
No suit that may concern my wedlock's breach,
I yield unto it ; but
To pass the bounds of modesty and chastity,
Sooner will I bequeath myself again
Unto this grave, and never part from hence,
Than taint my soul with black impurity.”²

Then the lover, promising to press his suit no more, conducts the woman to his own home.

The husband of both story and play, unable to keep his new wife in bounds, upbraids her for her treatment of him, and, after a quarrel in which he compares her with his former wife, is finally led to confess that he killed his wife for her. Through the courtesan's information he is arrested, and on his own public confession is condemned to die. At the moment of the execution, however, the real wife appears, and the mystery of the sleeping potion is explained. Agatha rescues her husband with the declaration,

“ Sir, Gonsales, whom you have condemned and commanded to be put to death this daie, is wrongfully condemned ; for it is not true that he hath poysoned his wife, but she is yet alive, and I am she : therefore, I beseche you, give order that execution maie be staied, since that your sentence grounded upon a false enformation and confession,

¹ *Farewell Mil. Prof.*, p. 170.

² *Hazlitt's Dodsley*, vol. ix, p. 71.

is unjust, as you maie plainly discerne, by me beyng here.”¹
 Mistress Arthur’s plea is similar :

“ This man’s condemn’d for pois’ning of his wife ;
 His poison’d wife yet lives, and I am she ;
 And therefore justly I release his bands.”²

Each lover proclaims the great virtue of the woman who has withstood his love, and the chastened husband, acknowledging his fault, returns to her.

To my mind, the source of *How a Man May Choose* not only is not negligible for an understanding of the play itself, but takes on an added interest in view of the influence of the play. For one thing, the influence on stage-craft was probably considerable. Jonson, in the last intermean of *The Magnetic Lady*, speaks of the demand that “some unexpected and new encounter break out to rectify all, and make good the conclusion.” The resolution of the complicated plot of a comedy or tragicomedy by the saving of a condemned man’s life or the return of one supposed to be dead, spread in the drama and was employed with every variation. Certainly this was due in part to *How a Man May Choose* and to the plays immediately imitating it, though the rescue motive in other forms was of course not unknown earlier.³ It is at least a striking coincidence that, probably very soon after *How a Man May Choose* appeared, Shakespeare revived in *Measure for Measure* the very similar motive of *Promos and Cassandra*, also derived from Cinthio.

¹ *Farewell Mil. Prof.*, p. 173.

² Hazlitt’s *Dodsley*, vol. ix, p. 94.

³ Cf. *Damon and Pithias*, *Comedy of Errors*, and *Case is Altered*, for the rescue from death, and *Much Ado* for the revival motive. Greene’s *James IV* with its theme of the faithful wife who is supposedly slain at the instigation of the King, her husband, in order to leave him free in the pursuit of a new love, and who returns in time to rescue her husband from the vengeance of her father is especially interesting as a forerunner of *How a Man May Choose*.

The number of plays actually indebted to *How a Man May Choose* is probably large. Prof. A. H. Quinn has shown that in many particulars the plot of *The Fair Maid of Bristow* follows that of *How a Man May Choose*. The relation of these two plays, however, is complicated by the fact that in some points not found in *How a Man May Choose*, *The Fair Maid* resembles *The Dutch Courtezan*. Marston's play itself belongs more or less superficially to this same group, for the plays also have many elements in common that go back to *How a Man May Choose*; but the common elements not drawn from *How a Man May Choose* are too numerous to be accidental, and leave us no choice but to believe that one play drew from the other or, less probably, both from the same source. Of *The Dutch Courtezan* Prof. Schelling remarks that, "although the chief personages of his [Marston's] main plot, even to the two old fathers, correspond, person for person, to those of *The Fair Maid* and *How a Man May Choose*, the subject is given a new turn by making the whole plot hinge on Franceschina the courtesan's demand that Malheureux kill Freevill, the husband, who is his best friend, as the means at once to gain Franceschina's love and avenge the wrong which she conceives that she has suffered by Freevill's neglect."¹ As Koepfel has pointed out,² Marston's main motive is drawn from Bandello's novel, *The Countess of Celant*, translated in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* and in Fenton's *Tragical Discourses*; and this fact would easily account for the new turn of which Prof. Schelling speaks, and explain the emphasis on the dashing courtesan and the two friends who are her lovers. But resemblances in this very matter of the courtesan and her intrigues furnish the

¹ *Elizabethan Drama*, vol. 1, p. 334.

² *Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's, John Marston's, und Beaumont u. Fletcher's*, pp. 28, 29.

best basis for connecting *The Dutch Courtezan* and *The Fair Maid* with each other as well as with *How a Man May Choose*, in spite of the fact that the crucial demand of Franceschina is lacking in *The Fair Maid*. It is possible that both Marston and the author of *The Fair Maid* knew *The Countess of Celant*; for, although in the most important points *The Dutch Courtezan* is closer to *The Countess of Celant* than is *The Fair Maid*, in one or two very minor points the case is reversed.¹ But the plays have too much in common that is found in neither *The Countess of Celant* nor *How a Man May Choose* to make it credible that the two authors worked their sources independently. The question remains, which play was the earlier.

Prof. Schelling's implication throughout is that *The Fair Maid* is prior to *The Dutch Courtezan*; indeed he places *The Fair Maid* about 1602. But Prof. Quinn, following Fleay, shows that the play was probably first performed in October, 1604. Except for the fact that Prof. Wallace claims to have proof, which he does not adduce, that *The Dutch Courtezan* was acted late in 1602,² I should say that Marston's play could not well be referred to a date earlier than 1603; for Crawford in his *Collectanea* (vol. II) leaves

¹ For instance, in *The Fair Maid* the courtesan is not deserted by the first lover as in *The Dutch Courtezan*, but she dismisses him for a new lover and desires his death because he has insulted her. In *The Countess of Celant* the first adventure of the courtesan with the two friends, a portion not used by Marston, is similar to this. A single resemblance like this, commonplace and lacking in the support of details, is not sufficient to indicate borrowing. Again, the naturalness of seeking poison from a physician may account for a commonplace resemblance of *The Fair Maid* to Riche's novel in a detail not found in *How a Man May Choose*. In both, the husband asks a doctor for poison, confessing that he wishes to poison his wife. The doctor, as his friend, seemingly consents, but, as lover of the wife, thwarts the plan.

² *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars, 1597-1603*, p. 75, notes 1 and 2.

little doubt that for the play Marston drew largely on Florio's *Montaigne*, which was not published till 1603.¹ Even so, there would be ample time for the production of *The Dutch Courtezan* between the appearance of Florio's translation and the first performance of *The Fair Maid*.

The strongest reason for considering *The Fair Maid* the debtor to *The Dutch Courtezan* instead of the reverse is found in the treatment in the two plays of the motives showing kinship with *The Countess of Celant*. Certainly Marston borrowed his main motive directly ; the bold outlines of his plot could never have been suggested by *The Fair Maid*. His treatment is simple, direct, and in the main close to Bandello's story. Corroborative evidence is found in the fact that the sub-plot of *The Dutch Courtezan* is drawn from Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, to which Marston would almost certainly have gone for *The Countess of Celant*. On the other hand, it is only after analysis that one discerns in *The Fair Maid* elements of the Italian story, and these are obscured and overlaid, as might be expected in an indirect borrowing. An analysis of the two plays in relation to their sources, on the basis that *The Dutch Courtezan* drew from *The Countess of Celant* and *How a Man May Choose*, and that *The Fair Maid* combined *How a Man May Choose* and *The Dutch Courtezan*, will make clear, I think, the relation of the two plays to each other and the gradual development of the complicated plot of *The Fair Maid*.

The Dutch Courtezan borrows from *The Countess of Celant* the courtesan's demand that her new lover kill a former lover, who is his friend, and the new lover's discovery of the plot to his friend. The supposed murder of the first lover

¹ Florio's translation was entered in the *Stationers' Register* as early as 1599, however, and Marston may have had access to the manuscript.

by the second in *The Dutch Courtesan* is only slightly similar to the murder of one of the two friends by a third party in *The Countess of Celant*. These elements, however, form the central thread of Marston's plot, and in borrowing from *How a Man May Choose* he has merely filled in and changed the tragedy to a comedy. From *How a Man May Choose*, Marston has added to the main characters of *The Countess of Celant* story the virtuous woman set over against the wanton, and the two old fathers; and to the main incidents the lover's declaring to the courtesan, in order to win her favor, that he has done murder for her sake, his immediate arrest at the instigation of the courtesan, the silence of the supposed victim until the murderer is about to be executed, the courtesan's eagerness to secure the execution of her lover, his rescue by the one supposed to be dead, and his quick disillusionment. Marston has, however, completely changed the situations in which these general motives occur by making the supposed victim not the wife but the lover's friend; and the motive of a wife's patient endurance of her husband's infatuation for a courtesan is introduced into *The Dutch Courtesan* only in a weak form—when the courtesan appears before the betrothed of the first lover to torment her with a feigned tale of his preference for herself.

The author of *The Fair Maid* has combined the two friends of *The Dutch Courtesan* and their relation to the courtesan, with the husband of *How a Man May Choose*, who neglects his wife for the courtesan. As Harbart, one of the friends in *The Fair Maid*, has never been a lover of the courtesan, and as Vallenger, the husband, takes the place of one of the friends in the rôle of the second lover, the result is a very complicated series of shifts in the motives of the sources. A brief statement of the essential parts of the action in their relation to the sources will best reveal these shifts and explain their value for the plot.

The Fair Maid opens with a situation drawn from *The Dutch Courtezan* that introduces to us the husband and wife drawn from *How a Man May Choose*. In *The Dutch Courtezan*, Freevill appears in the first scene introducing his friend Malheureux to the courtesan Franceschina, whom he is forsaking for his betrothed. Malheureux censures loose love, and immediately falls a victim to the courtesan's charms. The courtesan, because Freevill has deserted her, demands that Malheureux kill him as the condition of receiving her favor. Later at the home of Freevill's betrothed, where they are attending a masque and dance, the two friends pretend to quarrel, and leave the dance together; Malheureux presumably kills Freevill. Similarly, *The Fair Maid* opens with Challener's inviting his friend Vallenger to meet his betrothed¹ at a fête given at her home, a feature of which is a masque. Vallenger scoffs at love, and yet at first sight of the girl falls madly in love with her. The friends quarrel, leave the dance, and fight. Vallenger is wounded, and later wins the girl, only to mistreat her for the courtesan; Challener flees, but returning, on account of his love for the wife, in the disguise of a doctor, he performs the function of the lover of Mistress Arthur in *How a Man May Choose* by nullifying Vallenger's plot to murder his wife. The treatment at this point, however, is quite different in the two plays.

Then the two friends, Sentloe and Harbart, appear to complicate the plot. Harbart attempts to dissuade Sentloe from his love for the courtesan Florence and fails. The courtesan is invited to the wedding of Vallenger, who

¹ In *The Dutch Courtezan* the father of the betrothed has another daughter. In *The Fair Maid* the father has only one daughter, but a stage direction after l. 53 speaks of his "daughters." Perhaps this is due to the author's association of his father and daughter with Marston's father and daughters.

immediately falls in love with her. As the husband of *How a Man May Choose* invites the courtesan to his home and gives her the place of honor over his patient wife, Vallenger humiliates his wife at the wedding fête to please Florence. Florence now wishes to rid herself of Sentloe, at first casting him off to make way for Vallenger, and finally, as in *The Dutch Courtesan*, planning his death to avenge herself for his insult and scorn upon her dismissal of him. Vallenger, of his own initiative, plans to poison Sentloe; but, as in *The Dutch Courtesan*, Florence employs for her instrument Sentloe's best friend, Harbart, who, under the name Blunt, is playing the serving-man to her in order to watch over his friend and cure him of his infatuation, as Freevill in disguise waits on the Dutch courtesan to effect his plans for disenchanting Malheureux. Meanwhile, the courtesan casts off the now penniless Vallenger, whose father has disowned him because of his abuse of his wife and his plot to poison her. Blunt administers a sleeping potion to Sentloe, and by the ruse of bloodying the unconscious man and the sword of Vallenger, who has fallen asleep near by, fastens the guilt upon Vallenger, at the suggestion of the courtesan.¹ Later Blunt, or Harbart, is accused by the courtesan of being accessory to the murder, and on his own confession is condemned.

In this doubling of pretended murder, the motives of *How a Man May Choose* and *The Dutch Courtesan* are combined. Thus Vallenger, though, like the husband in *How a Man May Choose*, he has deserted his wife for the courtesan and tried to poison her while she is shielding him from the angry father, is condemned to die for slaying the former lover of the courtesan with the sword, as

¹ Prof. Schelling goes astray at this point in telling the story. Cf. *Eliz. Drama*, vol. I, p. 332.

in *The Dutch Courtezan*. The wife's rescue of the husband by appearing after he is condemned in *How a Man May Choose* becomes in *The Fair Maid* an effort to save him by offering herself as a substitute. But the knot is untied, as in *The Dutch Courtezan*, by the first lover of the courtesan, Sentloe, who after hiding out until Vallenger and Harbart are about to be executed, appears in time to save the husband, as in *How a Man May Choose*, and the friend, as in *The Dutch Courtezan*. In the end, the husband is cured of his love for the courtesan and restored to the wife, as in *How a Man May Choose*, and the friend who has been under the spell of the courtesan renounces her, as in *The Dutch Courtezan*.

This combination of motives itself seems to me the very strongest sort of evidence that *The Fair Maid* has as sources both *How a Man May Choose* and *The Dutch Courtezan*. Besides, *The Fair Maid* bears all the marks of a comparatively weak dramatist's effort to combine plots; for, in spite of a fairly successful union of the main elements of *How a Man May Choose* and *The Dutch Courtezan*, there is no real centralization of motives, and many threads are introduced which have little value in the working out of the plot, and which often confuse the author himself. Given the weaker dramatist with the more complicated plot, we are not likely to go wrong in determining the borrower.

Prof. Quinn has given a list of plays similar in treatment to *How a Man May Choose* and *The Fair Maid*, chiefly as regards the matter of the patient wife. Of these *The London Prodigal* shows most decidedly the influence of the motives in the Cinthio-Riche story, though in many respects it is rather dissimilar to all the plays that have been treated. A number of resemblances to *How a Man May Choose* and *The Fair Maid* are pointed out by Prof. Quinn. The similarity of *The London Prodigal* to *How a Man May*

Choose consists in the presence of Weathercock, a character whose echoing of words recalls Old Lusam, in the kindness of a neglected wife on meeting her needy husband whom a spoiled courtesan has spurned, and in her rescue of him as he is about to be arrested for his supposed murder of her. The two fathers of *The London Prodigal* are much nearer to *The Fair Maid* than to *How a Man May Choose*. The father of the girl leads her to change lovers, and the new lover proves a scoundrel while the old one continues his friendship; the father of the husband despairs of the prodigal when he mistreats his wife, and transfers his interest to the girl. The basis of the husband's dismissal by the courtesan—whom we only hear of—is his disinheritance and lack of money, as in *The Fair Maid*. Prof. Quinn, though he does not point out this vague kinship, calls attention to three passages in *The London Prodigal* resembling certain passages in *The Fair Maid*.¹ Again, the fact, though very inconclusive, is possibly worth noting that the wife of *The London Prodigal* is disguised as a "Dutch frow" and is called "tanakin," and that both of these terms are applied to the Dutch courtesan Franceschina. In discussing the authorship of *The London Prodigal*, which he is inclined to attribute to Marston, Mr. C. F. T. Brooke mentions the similarity of the Dutch-English used by these two characters.² It is not improbable that we have in *The London Prodigal* echoes of all three of these plays, so that *The London Prodigal* may have been written after *The Fair Maid*, 1604, and thus in the year of its publication, 1605. But the attempt to fix the date and the relationship of this play to the group is by no means convincing.

¹ *Shakespeare Apocrypha* (ed. Brooke), *The London Prodigal*, III, 3, 303 f.; v, 1, 315 f.; v, 1, 419. *The Fair Maid*, ll. 872 f., 571 f., 978. The last of these passages is found in *Fair Em.* (v, 1, 114), with practically the same wording as in *The London Prodigal*.

² *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, p. xxx, n. 1.

The Cinthio-Riche theme in some of its details appears also in Day's *Law Tricks*, published in 1608. Day has altered his material freely, and has practically omitted the motive of the courtesan pitted against the wife. Still the occurrence, with much the same treatment as in *How a Man May Choose*, of a patient and virtuous wife persecuted by her husband, wooed by a lover, supposedly poisoned at the husband's instigation, buried, rescued from the tomb, and finally presented alive in time to save her husband's life and to be reconciled to him, is sufficient to include Day's play in our group. In *Law Tricks* Horatio is both the husband's confidant and the wife's lover, as in Riche. When Count Lurdo, with the connivance of Horatio, has divorced his countess, Horatio takes advantage of the wife's distressed condition to urge his suit, but is always repulsed. She is finally befriended by Horatio's page, who offers her refuge with his parents. The husband commissions the now angered lover to poison the countess, and Horatio administers what he supposes to be poison, but what is only a sleeping potion prepared by the page's father, an apothecary. The page waits at the tomb for the wife's revival, and purposely frightens away Horatio, who, like Anselm in *How a Man May Choose*, has wandered to the tomb in grief and despair. The wife remains concealed after her rescue by the page, and, appearing as a ghost, demands revenge on Horatio. He in turn accuses the husband. The two are summarily condemned by the Duke to be enclosed alive in the tomb with the dead wife; but the wife appears alive, and frees the condemned men with a speech similar to those of Agatha and Mistress Arthur:

"Justice, great Duke! giue me my husbands life,
Both his and his; if your demaund be 'Why,'
See, she suruiues for whose death they should die."

The husband confesses his injustice and is reconciled, while

the page explains his part in the dénouement. The part of Lurdo and Emilia is a sort of substitute for the intrigue with the courtesan, though Lurdo's infatuation does not begin until after the divorce. Emilia, who is both nimble-witted and virtuous, leads Lurdo on till he offers to kill his wife for her and confesses some of his questionable practices; and the life she promises him, provided she yields to his suit and marries him, strongly recalls what Young Arthur suffers after his marriage to the courtesan. Whether or not Day went back to Riche or Cinthio for some points of his plot, the influence of *How a Man May Choose* seems pretty evident, especially in tone and general spirit.

Chronologically, Middleton's *Blurt, Master-Constable* probably deserves first consideration among the plays indebted to *How a Man May Choose*. But its interest here lies chiefly in the light that its relation to other plays of the group may be able to throw on the question of its interpretation, and so I have reserved it until after a discussion of the related plays. The story of *How a Man May Choose* seems to have been used in *Blurt, Master-Constable* without being very carefully woven into the whole, after Middleton's manner of introducing briefly a popular motive into his plots,¹ and this fact may help to account for "the fatal obscurity of plot" in *Blurt, Master-Constable* of which Ward complains.² Fontinelle's passion for the courtesan Imperia and his expla-

¹ As an instance, compare his use of the motive best known from *Decameron*, III, 3, that of the employment of the most unlikely person in a woman's circle as her unconscious messenger in a love intrigue. The first use of this I have noticed in the drama is in *Twelfth Night* (I, 5; II, 2; III, 1), where Olivia makes Malvolio her messenger. Middleton employs it in *Your Five Gallants* (IV, 2) and in *The Widow*. A similar device occurs in *The Family of Love* (I, 2) and in *The Roaring Girl* (III, 2). The motive was very popular, and has been pointed out in at least *The Fawn*, *The Widow*, *The Devil is an Ass*, and *The Witty Fair One*. Cf. also Chapman's *May Day* (II, 2) and Greene's *Planetomachia*.

² *History of English Dramatic Literature*, vol. II, p. 502.

nation of it on the basis that he loves variety, his suggestion of poisoning his wife, the wife's gentle spirit toward the courtesan and her willingness to share her husband with a rival, the courtesan's softening toward the wife, the wife's rescue of the husband from the death to which he has been condemned for his treatment of her, and the husband's final repentance, are all reminiscent of *How a Man May Choose*, in spite of some changes in the working out of the problem. Bullen, confronted by the inconsistency between the dénouement and this part of the play when interpreted in the most obvious way, has contended, in opposition to Ward, that Fontinelle's sudden passion for the courtesan is feigned and that his treatment of his bride is according to a plan previously arranged between them in order to further their own love.¹ But the very close relation of *Blurt* to other plays of the group, where the points in question are not left in the slightest doubt, would seem to uphold Ward. For example, in *The Fair Maid of Bristow*, the bridegroom, thoroughly in love with his wife, falls suddenly and completely under the spell of the courtesan and disparages his wife to her, and in the wife's attitude to the courtesan there is much to remind one of Middleton's comedy.

Some verbal resemblances will serve to show how closely the lines of treatment sometimes correspond. Fontinelle protests to the courtesan in speaking of his wife Violetta:

“ Now, by the heart of love, my Violet
Is a foul weed, (O pure Italian flower !)
She a black negro, to the white compare
Of this unequalled beauty ? ”²

With this passage compare two from *The Fair Maid*. In

¹ *Works of Middleton*, vol. I, Intro., pp. xxi ff.

² *Blurt, Master-Constable*, v, 2.

one the bridegroom, suddenly enamored of the courtesan, says to her :

“ The bee that Sucks the bitter Hemlock flouers,
When that he comes to tast the violet
Doth count his former food as trash and weedes
Thou art the Violet the bitter Hemlock shee.”

And in the other the wife defends her lord by saying,

“ Faire Florence is the mistris of his hart,
To her I am but as a Counterfit,
Rather I am a ethyop, . . . ”¹

Again, we find Violetta of *Blurt, Master-Constable* pleading with the courtesan in behalf of her husband :

“ Prithee, good wench, use him well.

· · · · ·
If he deserve not to be used well, . . . I'll engage myself, dear beauty,
to thine honest heart.”²

And Anabell says under similar circumstances,

“ But yet I pray, for my sake vse him kind,
I am sure heele deserue it at your hands.”³

If these parallel passages from similar situations indicate anything in regard to the influence of *Blurt, Master-Constable* on *The Fair Maid*, it seems plausible to me that the author of *The Fair Maid* was following the interpretation given to *Blurt, Master-Constable* upon the Elizabethan stage, borrowing the ideas because they were associated with the theme with which he was dealing.

It is not alone the influence of this one story from Cinthio

¹ Ll. 318 ff. and 569 ff. This second passage is one of those cited by Prof. Quinn as paralleled in *The London Prodigal*. Cf. *L. P.* v, 1 :

“ I am no Aethyope,
No wanton Cressed, nor a changing Hellen.”

² V. 2.

³ Ll. 507 f.

or the relative dates of the plays involved that is of interest in the study of this group. For the interrelations of the plays, all except *Law Tricks* published within three years, show the thorough familiarity of the Elizabethan dramatists with the various treatments of a theme, the acceptance of popular motives on the stage as community property, and the general use of popular and telling phrases and figures.¹

C. R. BASKERVILL.

¹The influence of the Cinthio-Riche story was hardly confined to the plays treated. At any rate, the central motives of this group are used extensively in the drama. In *The Puritan*, for example, a man is rescued from the gallows at the last moment by the revival of his supposed victim, who has merely been under the influence of a sleeping potion. Likewise in Beaumont and Fletcher's "Triumph of Love" from *Four Plays in One*, the same situation occurs in a more complicated form. Indeed, the sleeping potion motive, usually combined, as in our plays, with the rescue of a condemned man at the last moment, is of frequent occurrence. For some additional uses of it, not considered closely enough related to the plays discussed in this paper to call for treatment, see Scherer's edition of *Satiro-mastix*, *Materialien*, 20, p. xi, and G. C. Moore Smith's edition of *Hymenaeus*, Cambridge, 1908, pp. xii, xiii. Among later plays may be added Sharpham's *Fleire*, Mason's *Muleasses the Turk*, *The Honest Lawyer*, May's *Old Couple*, *The Costly Whore*, Rutter's *Shepherd's Holiday*, Berkeley's *Lost Lady*, and Cartwright's *Siege or Love's Convert*. (Cf. Genest's analyses.) The love philtre in Sidney's *Arcadia*, utilized by Shirley, is a notable parallel. Prof. Stoll, in his *John Webster*, discusses the relation of the later plays, *A Cure for a Cuckold* and *Parliament of Love*, to *The Dutch Courtesan*. Of the two *The Parliament of Love* shows the closer relation to our group. The central motive in the resolution of the plays influenced by *The Dutch Courtesan*, the return or revival of one supposedly killed—usually the quarrel is over an amour and the return is just at the moment to save the life of the condemned opponent, who in most cases has been an intimate friend before the quarrel—was probably as extensively used as any other motive of the group of plays, though here, as in the case of the sleeping potion, I do not mean to imply that there was necessarily any influence exerted by our group. I recall now Webster's *The Devil's Law Case*, Shirley's *Gamester and Wedding*, Rider's *Twins*, Suckling's *Goblins*, May's *Old Couple*, and Carliell's *Deserving Favorite*.

APPENDIX.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL
MEETING OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
HELD AT
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, N. J.,
AND AT
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO, ILL.,
DECEMBER 28, 29, 30, 1908.

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

THE ASSOCIATION MEETING.

The twenty-sixth annual meeting of the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA was held at Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., December 28, 29, 30, in accordance with the following invitation:

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

PRINCETON, N. J., *December 6, 1907.*

PROFESSOR C. H. GRANDGENT,

Secretary of the Modern Language Association of America.

My dear Sir:—

I write, on behalf of my colleagues of the Modern Language and English Departments of Princeton University, to express the hope that the Modern Language Association will meet in Princeton in the winter of 1908.

Hoping that you will urge this invitation upon the Association in every proper way, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON,
President.

All the sessions were held in McCosh Hall. Professor F. M. Warren, President of the Association, presided at all.

The railways offered reduced rates, but the members in attendance failed to present a sufficient number of certificates.

FIRST SESSION, MONDAY, DECEMBER 28.

The Association met at 2.40 p. m. The session was opened by an address of welcome from President Woodrow Wilson.

The Secretary of the Association, Professor C. H. Grandgent, submitted as his report the published *Proceedings* of the last annual meeting and the complete volume of the *Publications* of the Association for 1908.

The report was approved.

The Secretary transmitted the following communication from the Association of American Universities, concerning a vote past by the Modern Language Association on December 26, 1907 (see *Proceedings* for 1907, p. xii):

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, *May* 21, 1908.

Dear Professor Grandgent:

The following is an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee of The Association of American Universities, held on Thursday, May 7th, at New York:

"In the matter of the resolution adopted by the Modern Language Association of America, and submitted to The Association of American Universities with a request that action be taken, which was referred with power to the Executive Committee—

Resolved, that it is desirable to adopt some plan of obviating as far as possible the duplication of work in doctoral theses intended for publication—

it was, on motion, resolved that, in view of the attitude of the delegates at the last meeting of The Association of American Universities, that it would be unwise to take up this question, no action be taken thereon."

The reasons for this action are set forth in full in Professor W.

H. Carpenter's letter to you dated January 15, 1908. I regret that I am unable to report more favorably in the premises.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH WARREN,
*for Harvard University, Secretary,
The Association of American Universities.*

The above mentioned letter from Professor W. H. Carpenter is as follows:

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *January 15, 1908.*

PROFESSOR C. H. GRANDGENT,
*Secretary, Modern Language Association,
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.*

Dear Professor Grandgent:

At the conference of the Association of American Universities held in Ann Arbor January ninth and tenth, the resolution of the Modern Language Association communicated to me in your letter of December 28 was duly submitted to the Association for such action as it should desire to take. The matter brought forth considerable discussion, some of it entirely adverse to any action whatsoever in the premises by the Association of American Universities. It was the opinion of some of the members that the matter of publication of dissertation titles as proposed did not come really within the provenience of the Association. Our single publication is the annual report of the proceedings, which has thus far been simply what it purports to be, an account of the annual meeting. It was felt that it was hardly proper to burden the scope of this publication by admitting extraneous matter of any character, particularly since it would entail a considerable expense to publish these titles. It was suggested that the Carnegie Institution would be a proper place to which to take this proposition since they already publish historical titles along similar lines. Ultimately the whole matter was referred to the Executive Committee of the Association with power. I would say, however, that the action of the Executive Committee is not apt to be favorable to the proposition, and it is more than probable that they will turn it down for the reasons that I have already specified.

I take the opportunity of communicating this action to you at this time since it may be important to do something else with it at the earliest possible moment.

Yours very truly,

WM. H. CARPENTER.

On behalf of the Executive Council, the Secretary nominated the following gentlemen for honorary membership:

Alessandro D'Ancona, Professor of Italian Literature, University of Pisa.

Francesco D'Ovidio, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Naples.

Francesco Novati, Professor of Romance Literature, University of Milan.

They were unanimously elected.

On motion of the Secretary, it was

Voted, That the Secretary of the Central Division receive from the Association an annual salary of \$75.

This amount was chosen as being the equivalent of \$100 for each of the three out of four years that the Division Secretary has charge of a program.

The Secretary suggested the expediency of expressing an opinion on two questions to which other learned bodies are now giving their attention: (1) coöperation with the Carnegie Institute in the publication of literary and philological studies; (2) the abolition of the tariff on books and other means of education. After discussion by Professors E. C. Armstrong, C. W. Hodell, H. E. Greene, and Dr. J. D. Fitz-Gerald, it was voted that committees be appointed by the chair to draw up resolutions on these two subjects. The President named, for the first, Professors

H. A. Todd, L. F. Mott, and H. E. Greene; for the second, Professors G. Gruener, C. B. Wright, and J. E. Spingarn. The committees were instructed to report on Wednesday morning.

The Treasurer of the Association, Mr. W. G. Howard, submitted the following report:

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, December 26, 1907,					\$2,846 26
From Members, Life,	\$	40 00			
" " for 1905,		6 00			
" " " 1906,		15 00			
" " " 1907,		132 00			
" " " 1908,		2,178 33			
" " " 1909,		144 35			
" " " 1910,		3 00			
					<hr/>
					\$2,518 68
From Libraries for Vols. VIII-XX,	\$	79 20			
" " " " XXI,		7 30			
" " " " XXII,		7 50			
" " " " XXIII,		124 20			
" " " " XXIV,		64 85			
					<hr/>
					\$ 283 05
For Publications, Vols. X-XX,	\$	13 70			
" " " XXI,		9 30			
" " " XXII,		13 83			
" " " XXIII,		46 00			
					<hr/>
					\$ 82 83
For Reprints, Vol. XXIII,					3 75
From Advertisers, Vol. XXII,	\$	128 00			
" " " XXIII,		60 00			
					<hr/>
					\$ 188 00
For Postage Stamps,					1 00
Interest, Eutaw Savings Bank,	\$	50 40			
" Cambridge Savings Bank,		33 54			
" Cambridge Trust Co.,		25 13			
					<hr/>
					109 07
					<hr/>
					3,186 38
					<hr/>
					<u>\$6,032 64</u>

EXPENDITURES.

To Secretary for Salary,	\$ 400 00	
" " " Postage,	43 30	
" " " Typewriting,	1 65	
" " " Proof-reading,	6 50	
" " " Printing,	41 05	
" " " Expressage,	3 90	
	<hr/>	\$ 496 40
To Treasurer for Salary,	\$ 200 00	
" " " Clerical Work,	16 50	
" " " Printing,	79 63	
" " " Postage,	18 14	
" " " Expressage,	50	
	<hr/>	\$ 314 77
For Printing <i>Publications</i> ,		
Vol. XXIII, No. 1,	\$ 428 21	
" XXIII, " 2,	449 56	
" XXIII, " 3,	566 02	
" XXIII, " 4,	559 91	
	<hr/>	\$2,003 70
For Printing Program 26th Annual Meeting,	\$ 78 69	
To Secretary Central Division for Printing and		
Postage,	72 17	
Exchange,	11 38	
	<hr/>	\$2,977 11
Balance on hand { Eutaw Savings Bank,	\$1,490 50	
Dec. 26, 1908, { Cambridge Savings Bank,	864 52	
" Trust Co.,	700 51	
	<hr/>	3,055 53
		<hr/>
		<u>\$6,032 34</u>

The President of the Association, Professor F. M. Warren, appointed the following committees:

(1) To audit the Treasurer's report: Professors J. Geddes and J. D. Bruner.

(2) To nominate officers: Professors F. N. Scott, C. von Klenze, and W. W. Comfort.

The reading of papers was then begun.

1. "Chaucer's *Legend of Medea*." By Professor Robert K. Root, of Princeton University. [See *Publications*, xxiv, 1.]

[The lines in the Man of Law's Prologue which purport to refer to Chaucer's *Legend of Medea* are based on a passage in the *Roman de la Rose*. This and other considerations tend to show that, when the Man of Law's Prologue was composed, the *Legend of Medea* had not yet been written. If so, the latter work must be dated later than 1390. Such a date involves several conclusions which concern the *Legend of Good Women* as a whole.—*Twenty minutes*.]

2. "An Unpublished Collection of Old French Fables." By Professor Murray P. Brush, of Johns Hopkins University. [See *Publications*, xxiv, 3.]

[Ysopet III of Paris, an Old French fable collection hitherto unpublished. Description of the manuscript, its date and provenience. Form and source of the collection. Its place in relation to other collections in Old French. Considerations upon the text of the fables.—*Twenty-five minutes*.]

3. "Goethe's Homunculus, a Study in Faust Criticism." By Professor Karl D. Jessen, of Bryn Mawr College.

[While Goethe himself left no doubt as to the interpretation of Euphorion, his testimony regarding Homunculus is scanty and vague. Consequently the number of attempts to interpret the symbolical meaning of the latter is appallingly large. The paper endeavored to demonstrate that out of the difficulty there is a way, hinted at by Goethe in his schematic outlines of the second part of Faust.—*Twenty minutes*.]

4. "The Results of Mrs. Macdonald's Discoveries regarding Jean Jacques Rousseau." By Professor Albert Schinz, of Bryn Mawr College.

[Summary of the discoveries: (1) falsification of original Epinay *Mémoires*; (2) second alteration of the *Mémoires* before printing; (3) misstatements of scholars regarding the reliability of the published *Mémoires*.—Discussion of Ritter's position that there are no proofs of Grimm's part in the falsifications mentioned above.—Question of children. Problem of insanity.—*Twenty minutes*.]

5. "The Purport of Lyly's *Endimion*." By Dr. Percy W. Long, of Cambridge, Mass. [See *Publications*, xxiv, 1.]

[An impersonal allegory of courtly love, hitherto unexplained, accounts for the oddities in Lyly's *Endimion* which led Halpin to assume the existence of a personal allegory.

Cynthia = Heavenly Beauty
 Tellus = Earthly Beauty
 Endimion = Heavenly, or Platonic, love
 Corsites = Earthly, or Sensual, love.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

6. "Ælfric's Legend of St. Swithun." By Professor Gordon Hall Gerould, of Princeton University. [See *Anglia*, N. F. xx, pp. 347-357.]

[The work on which Ælfric based his account of St. Swithun was written in 981 by Lantfred, a monk of Winchester. Two redactions of this are extant, one of them, however, only in a condensed form. It was the original of this version which Ælfric, writing some sixteen years afterwards and in the same monastery, adapted and translated. His legend has value in determining the original form of Lantfred's work and furnishes independent evidence as to the growth of the Swithun cult.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

At 8.30 p. m. the Association met in Room 10, McCosh Hall, to hear an address by Professor Frederick Morris Warren, President of the Association, entitled "A Plea for the Study of Medieval Latin."

After the address, the members and guests of the Association were received by President and Mrs. Wilson at their residence.

SECOND SESSION, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29.

The session began at 9.40 a. m.

7. "The Poetry of Sully Prudhomme." By Professor E. P. Dargan, of the University of Virginia.

[His manner of life and character. Tenderness, nobility, and melancholy his chief traits. A metaphysician *malgré lui*. Hence, he represents two types of poetry, the sentimental and the reflective. Some examples. 'Other sporadic types. Technique and individuality—the *Testament Poétique*. His enduring qualities, his creed, and place in the latter-day choir.—*Twenty minutes*.]

8. "Milton and the Revival of the Sonnet." By Dr. Raymond D. Havens, of the University of Rochester.

[The differences between the sonnets of Milton and those of the Elizabethans and Italians.—Few sonnets written between 1660 and 1742.—The ignorance on the part of eighteenth century writers of most Elizabethan literature.—The low opinion held of Shakspeare's and Spenser's sonnets by those who knew them.—In consequence, the slight influence of these poems during the period.—Milton's great popularity in the latter part of the century. The vogue of the minor poems began only a few years before the revival of the sonnet.—The probable connection between the two.—The early sonneteers were admirers and imitators of Milton.—Their high opinion of his sonnets.—A detailed examination of the leading eighteenth century sonneteers, including Wordsworth, showing that their work was unlike that of the Elizabethans or Italians but resembles closely that of Milton.—*Fifteen minutes*.]

9. "A Definition of *Petrarchismo*." By Dr. John Milton Berdan, of Yale University. [See *Publications*, XXIV, 4.]

[*Petrarchismo* differentiated from Petrarchism. Petrarch the first. Two distinct types of Italian *Petrarchismo*, that of the *quattrocentisti* of the *cinquecentisti*. Its arrival in England, its development in France, its flourishing period in England. Conclusions to be deduced.—*Twenty minutes*.]

10. "*Chauvin* (*Chauvinisme*—*Calvin*, *Cauvin*): Truth and Fiction in the Story of its Origin." By Professor A. Marshall Elliott, of the Johns Hopkins University. In the absence of the author, selections from this paper were read by Professor E. C. Armstrong.

[Opinions of lexicographers differ greatly as to the origin of the term *Chauvin*, in its more general and original acceptation as ex-

pressing an exaggerated patriotism. They all suppose it to have been originally a proper name but they are at variance as to the channel, the mode and means by which this proper name came to denote a vain-glorious *amor patriæ*. One class of writers has struggled to generalize the meagre results of their investigations in regard to the word; another class has been equally strenuous in giving the most precise details, often purely imaginary, in support of their contention, while still a third class has sought to straddle the difficulty by combining two or more sometimes equally objectionable, or even impossible, modes of derivation. Four principal theories have been held, and some of them are still held, as to the origin of Chauvin; history of these theories.—*Ten minutes.*]

11. "The Influence of Salvator Rosa in English Literature of the Eighteenth Century." By Professor E. E. Hale, Jr., of Union College.

[The love of nature arising in England in the eighteenth century found satisfaction largely in the beautiful and the charming, in the beauty of the grove and the plain. The delight in the fierce and the wild aspects of nature, later called picturesque and romantic, was in several cases suggested or stimulated by the sentiment of the landscape of Salvator Rosa.]

This paper was discusst by Professors C. H. Grandgent and F. N. Scott.

12. "Pössneck and *Hermann und Dorothea*." By Professor Charles Julius Kullmer, of Syracuse University.

[The materials concerning the relation of Goethe to Pössneck and the resemblances between the poem and local conditions, which appeared in the monograph, *Pössneck the Scene of 'Hermann und Dorothea'*, were supplemented by materials since obtained by further research in the city archives; and a criticism of the results, which had not been attempted in the monograph, was given.—*A twenty minute abstract.*]

[At the close of this session there was a meeting of the Concordance Society.]

THIRD SESSION, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29.

The session began at 2.45 p. m.

The following telegraphic message from the Central Division was received and read by the Secretary:

The members of the Central Division, meeting in Chicago, extend to the parent body hearty congratulations on the completion of a quarter of a century of increasingly successful endeavors.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON,
Secretary.

The reading of papers was resumed.

13. "French Poetry for English Readers." By Professor Brander Matthews, of Columbia University. [See *The Forum*, February, 1909.]

[English readers often find French poetry less satisfying than German or Italian. Three reasons suggested for this. First, the extreme clarity of the French language. Second, the absence of pronounced rhythm in French verse. Third, the fact that words primary in appeal to the French often seem secondary to us.—*Twenty minutes.*]

14. "The Facts of Pierre Du Ryer's Life." By Professor H. Carrington Lancaster, of Amherst College.

[Position held by Du Ryer among French dramatists of the seventeenth century. Sources of information regarding him. Documents with his signature in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Evidence that he was the son of Isaac Du Ryer and had become *secrétaire du roi* as early as 1621. Events of his life as a dramatist and translator.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

15. "The United States in European Literature." By Professor Camillo von Klenze, of Brown University.

[The evolution of the attitude of Europe towards the United States furnishes an interesting comment on the attitude towards life in

the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the eighteenth century, the Roussellian love for savages and wild nature joined during the American Revolution with the newly arisen democratic fervor and love for the simple life to make America appear as the very embodiment of the highest human aspirations (Schiller, Kant, Goethe, especially Chateaubriand). With waning Romanticism a reaction sets in (Lenau, Dickens, Kürnberger, etc.) In the second half of the nineteenth century, the Civil War and the writings of Emerson and others reveal to Europe a different side of American life; and towards the end of the century, the rise of Industrialism and the Spanish War compel attention. At the close of the nineteenth century, for the first time a critical study of the United States is undertaken (Bryce, Polenz, Münsterberg, Lamprecht, and others).—*Twenty minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professors H. Wood, A. Schinz, M. D. Learned, and K. D. Jessen.

16. "The Beginnings of Byronism in Spain." By Professor Philip H. Churchman, of Clark College.

[Byronism comes later in Spain than in France. Periodicals show little knowledge of Byron's verse before 1835; but thereafter we find them publishing occasional translations. Versions in book form are most abundant in 1828-30, all in prose and based on French translations. The earliest direct literary translations were probably Da Francisca Larrea's *Manfred* and Heredia's short pieces.—*Twenty minutes.*]

17. "The Moors in Spanish Popular Poetry before 1600." By Professor William Wistar Comfort, of Haverford College.

[A study of the Moors as portrayed in the *Poema del Cid*, *Poema de Fernán González*, and the *romances* (Durán's collection). Comparisons with the Saracens of the French epic and of the Italian court epic. The progress from realism to artistic romance is briefly reviewed from the *Cid* to Ariosto. This paper was intended to form part of a more extensive study of the rôle of the Saracens in medieval Christian poetry.—*Twenty minutes.*]

[At the close of this session there was a meeting of the American Dialect Society.]

In the evening the gentlemen of the Association were entertained in the grill-room of the Princeton Inn. A smoke talk was given by Ex-President Francis Landey Patton.

The ladies of the Association were entertained by Mrs. W. U. Vreeland.

FOURTH SESSION, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30.

The fourth session began at 9.45 a. m.

In the absence of Professor J. W. Cunliffe, who was in attendance at the Central Division meeting, Professor H. A. Todd presented the report of the Committee on the Reproduction of Early Texts:

The Association at its last joint meeting appointed Professors Cunliffe (Wisconsin), Gayley (California), Kittredge (Harvard), Manly (Chicago), and Todd (Columbia) as a Committee to promote:—(1) the acquisition of photographic reproductions of early texts in modern European languages by American University Libraries; (2) the circulation of index cards of reproductions so acquired; (3) the cataloguing of original texts prior to 1660 in public and private libraries in the United States and Canada. With regard to the first aim here set forth, the Committee has confined itself to spreading information as to how photographic reproductions can be obtained, leaving the responsibility of ordering them to the libraries or individuals interested. The main energies of the Committee have been given to arranging for the publication of index cards of reproductions at present in American libraries and acquired from time to time. Some difficulty was experienced at the outset as to what texts should be included in the scheme, and after consultation with Mr. William C. Lane, Librarian of Harvard University, it was decided to restrict its scope to the following classes:—

A. Reproductions of manuscripts.

1. Published commercially in a considerable number of copies.
2. Reproduced in single or very few copies, on individual orders.

- B. Reproductions of early printed texts, reproduced in single or very few copies on individual orders.

Reproductions of early printed texts printed commercially in a considerable number of copies were, after careful consideration, excluded, on the ground that their inclusion would add greatly to the cost of the index cards without proportionately increasing their usefulness. A sufficient number of subscriptions was obtained by the Committee to induce the American Library Association to undertake the printing of the index cards, and the Committee wishes to express its indebtedness to the A. L. A. Publishing Board and its officials for the kindly and helpful interest they have taken in the project. It is hoped that further subscriptions to the series of index cards will be obtained, as in course of time this will prove of substantial assistance to those engaged in research work in the modern European languages. The cards are issued by the A. L. A. Board at cost price, about three cents a title (two cards each). The expense of subscribing for the titles now in hand will not be more than \$3.00, and the annual amount is likely to be less than that for many years to come.

JOHN W. CUNLIFFE,
Chairman.

Professor Todd exhibited specimens of the cards. The report was adopted.

A report from the Committee of Fifteen was presented by the Chairman, Professor L. A. Loiseaux. This Committee was appointed by the Executive Council,—in accordance with a vote past by the Association on December 28, 1906,—to “devise a uniform system of grammatical terminology . . . and report to the Association at its next meeting or as soon as practicable thereafter.” The Committee was also instructed “to recommend such changes as may be needed in the lists of text-books suggested by the Association in its report,” *i. e.*, the Report of the Committee of Twelve. See Proceedings for 1906, p. xii. This second duty was imposed on the Committee in response to a request from the College Entrance Examina-

tion Board, and the Committee's report related to this matter alone.

The report comprised a proposed course in Spanish and six long lists of books for the Elementary, Intermediate, and Advanced grades of French and German. After a protracted discussion, in which Professors E. W. Olmsted, M. P. Whitney, L. F. Mott, C. H. Grandgent, M. V. Young, J. D. Bruner, J. F. Coar, W. M. Hervey, and Mr. W. D. Head participated, it was voted, on motion of Professor Olmsted, that the report be referred to a committee consisting of the Chairman of the Committee of Fifteen and such other members of that Committee as he may select.

On behalf of the same Committee, Professor Loiseaux offered this resolution:

Resolved, That it is desirable to establish an optional test in pronunciation and ability to understand the foreign language, as a part of the college entrance examination, and that additional credit be given for such ability.

After discussion, the Association voted against the adoption of the resolution in this form. Mr. W. D. Head then suggested a different wording:

Resolved, That it is desirable to establish a test in pronunciation and ability to understand the foreign language, as part of the college entrance examination.

And the resolution was adopted.

The Committee appointed for that purpose at the first session presented this resolution:

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by the chair to consult with the Carnegie Institution in regard to the advisability of bringing about a closer relation between that Institution and the various associations of scholars in the United States devoted to the study of literary and philological topics.

The resolution was adopted. The President, Professor F. M. Warren, appointed as members of the committee: Professors C. H. Grandgent, H. A. Todd, W. U. Vreeland, O. F. Emerson, A. R. Hohlfeld.

The committee created at the first session to draw up a resolution on the tariff offered the following:

Resolved, (1) That the Modern Language Association of America, representing the scholars and teachers of the modern languages and literatures in the schools and colleges of the United States, believing that the present tariff laws, with their import duties upon works of art, books printed in foreign countries, and scientific apparatus, impose an unjust burden upon scientific work in this country and act as an obstacle to the advancement of learning and general culture, while accomplishing little as regards the end for which such laws are framed, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States, in the proposed revision of the tariff laws, to remove the existing duties upon works of art and their reproductions, including photographs, upon all books printed in foreign countries, and upon scientific instruments intended for the private use of investigators.

(2) That the Association instruct its Secretary to communicate to Congress, at the proper time and through the proper channels, a copy of these resolutions.

The resolution was unanimously adopted. [A copy of it was sent by the Secretary, on January 7, to the Hon. Sereno Payne, Chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means.]

On motion of Professor Spingarn, it was

Voted, That a committee of five be appointed by the Chair to consider the advisability of extending the scope of the *Publications* of the Association, and to report to the Association at its next annual meeting.

The President, Professor F. M. Warren, appointed as members of this committee: Professors J. E. Spingarn, B. L. Bowen, E. C. Armstrong, C. B. Wilson, F. N. Scott.

The Auditing Committee reported that the Treasurer's report was found correct, and recommended its acceptance. The recommendation was adopted.

On motion of the Secretary, it was

Voted, That in the event of the absence of the Secretary during the years 1909-10, the Treasurer be authorized to act as Secretary.

The Nominating Committee reported the following nominations:

President: Marion Dexter Learned, University of Pennsylvania.

First Vice-President: Gustav Gruener, Yale University.

Second Vice-President: Everett Ward Olmsted, Cornell University.

Third Vice-President: William Allan Neilson, Harvard University.

The candidates nominated were unanimously elected officers of the Association.

On motion of Professor H. E. Greene, it was unanimously

Resolved, That the members of the Modern Language Association of America wish to express to the authorities of Princeton University and to the Local Committee their hearty appreciation of the admirable provision for the comfort and entertainment of the Association; to thank President and Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Vreeland, and the officers and members of the Nassau Club, for their hospitality to the members of the Association; and to record their gratitude to Ex-President Patton for his delightfully suggestive and stimulating talk on Tuesday evening.

[Copies of this resolution were sent to all the persons mentioned.]

The reading of papers was resumed.

18. "A Recently Discovered Fragment of an Old French Life of Julius Cæsar." By Professor Henry A. Todd, of Columbia University. [See *Publications*, XXIV, 4.]

[This fragment was unearthed in a second-hand book store in New York, the parchment serving as lining to the board binding of a sixteenth century Latin text. It is different from the hitherto known lives of Cæsar, and not without interest.—*Five minutes.*]

19. "'Amore e Monna Lagia e Guido ed Io:' a New Interpretation of the Sonnet by Guido Cavalcanti." By Dr. James E. Shaw, of the Johns Hopkins University.

[The interpretation,—which is based on information obtained from the poetical correspondence of Cavalcanti with Dante and Guido Orlandi, from the *ballata* of Lapo Gianni, "gentil donna cortese e di bonaire," and from that of Guido Orlandi, "Come servo francato,"—is as follows:—Lapo Gianni (the "ser costui" of this sonnet) has more than once boasted of his amorous relation to Lagia, without caring to conceal her name, and has so proved himself unworthy of the traditions and ideals of the "dolce stil nuovo." For this reason she has withdrawn from him. The poet is here congratulating Lagia, Orlandi, and himself on the severance of their various connexion with the unworthy love of Lapo. The "cui," "lui," and "elli" of verses 3, 6, and 8, respectively, refer to that unworthy love personified. The last verse is an ironical reference to Cavalcanti's own interest in Lagia.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

20. "*Beowulf* and the *Saga of Hrolf Kraki*." By Professor William W. Lawrence, of Columbia University, [See *Publications*, XXIV, 1.]

[Contrary to the recently published theory of Axel Olrik (*Danmarks Heltedigtning*, I), the paper aimed to show that there may well be a connection between Beowulf's contest with Grendel and Böðvar Bjarki's fight with the monster at the court of Hrolf Kraki. The attempt was made to define the relation between these two versions of the episode and those in Saxo Grammaticus and the *Bjarkarmur*. It is believed that this will throw some light on the problem of origins. This discussion leads naturally to an attack

on certain current theories as to the evolution of the material in the poem.—*A ten-minute summary.*]

21. "The First Book Printed in England and its Source." By Professor Ernest F. Langley, of Dartmouth College.

[This paper traced rapidly the history of the derivation and fortunes of the collection of maxims published in England by Caxton in 1477 under the title of *Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*.—Translation into English and printing of the *Dictes*.—The French version and its author, Guillaume de Thignonville.—Its popularity in France.—The Latin original and its famous compiler, Giovanni da Procida.—General comparison of the English version with the Latin.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

This paper was discussed by Dr. H. N. MacCracken.

22. "The Influence of the Translation Technique of J. H. Voss on Goethe's Hexameter." By Professor Clarence W. Eastman, of Amherst College. [To appear in *Publications*, xxv, 2.]

[Internal evidence corroborates Goethe's own admission of his admiration for the metrical technique of Johann Heinrich Voss. Certain formulæ and words that lent themselves to the dactylic hexameter were borrowed by Goethe from Voss's translation of Homer. *Vergleichbar, wo er zu ruhen gewohnt war, hochherzig, trat er an ihn heran*, etc., belong to this group. Other formulæ probably borrowed by Voss from Klopstock and Stolberg and developed by him into mannerisms appear in Goethe's hexameter.—*Twenty minutes.*]

23. "Fortune's Wheel in the *Roman de la Rose*." By Professor Stanley L. Galpin, of Amherst College. [See *Publications*, xxiv, 2.]

[In the Roman art and literature the wheel is used as a symbol of Fortune's mutability. Medieval art and literature give it an allegorical and practical significance. Guillaume de Lorris treats the wheel conventionally, while Jean de Meung gives it strange forms unknown to his sources.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Mr. S. L. Wolff and Professor C. H. Grandgent.

FIFTH SESSION, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30.

The fifth and last session began at 2.50 p. m.

24. "The *Fabliau* in English Literature." By Professor G. H. McKnight, of the Ohio State University.

[The term *fabliau* has been inaccurately used by many eminent writers. Only within recent years has the literary *genre* found satisfactory definition. *Fabliaux* handle stories derived in great part from popular tradition. Many of the *fabliau* themes handled by Chaucer and others circulate to-day in popular story. Many of the *fabliau* stories have been made use of by dramatists. In later English literature *fabliau* and fable have been confused. Many *fabliau* themes have found a place in the jest-book collections. But in general the ballad form has been the one in which in later English literature such stories have been handled. Such humorous tales in verse as Burns's *Tam O'Shanter* and Byron's *Beppo* are not true *fabliaux*. About the latest true *fabliau* in English is Allen Ramsay's *The Monk and the Miller's Wife*.—Twenty minutes.]

This paper was discust by Dr. H. S. Canby.

25. "The Collaboration of Webster and Dekker." By Dr. Frederick E. Pierce, of Yale University. [See *Yale Studies in English*, xxxvii.]

[Webster consistently uses the Latin element of our language much more than Dekker. Some scenes in the collaborated plays show the same relatively large percentage of Latin words as Webster; others show the low ratio of these words consistently used by Dekker. The results of this test are supported by numerous parallel passages, numerous similarities of incident, by considerations of characterization and general atmosphere, and by metrical tests and the use of dialect where these can be applied.—Twenty minutes.]

26. "Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* as Epic and as Drama." By Dr. Percy A. Hutchison, of Harvard University.

[Roughly speaking, every epic poem is an epic either of action or of thought. The *Odyssey* is primarily an epic of action; the *Paradise Lost*, primarily an epic of thought. Epics of the first type derive their unity from the dominating personality of some character who is more or less constantly present; those of the second, from the fundamental theme which it is their purpose to develop. This theme may or may not be definitely stated. Milton's epic derives its unity, not from the presence either of Satan or of Adam; the *Paradise Lost* has unity because it is a consistent attempt to "justify the ways of God to men." Except for the fact that Milton develops his theological thesis concretely rather than abstractly, *Paradise Lost* would be as near akin to the *De Rerum Natura* as it is to the *Odyssey*. In the *Idylls of the King*, the personality of Arthur is far too shadowy to weld the separate poems into an epic of action, the idealistic thesis of the Holy Grail not worked out sufficiently to weld them into an epic of thought. But the *Idylls* are concerned not merely with the story of Arthur; they are concerned also, and perhaps much more, with the drama of *Lancelot and Guinevere*. But just as Tennyson has failed to give us true epic, so also has he failed to give us true drama; what he has given us is drama with epic background. Drama and epic come together in the human-spiritual ending of the *Guinevere*. Thus the *Idylls* form an original genre, Epic-Drama.—*Twenty minutes.*]

27. "A Prospective Edition of the *Chanson de Roland*." By Professor F. B. Luquiens, of Yale University. [See *Transactions* of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, xv.]

[The writer of this paper is preparing a new edition of the *Roland*. Edmund Stengel's edition is unsatisfactory because it is based upon an incorrect conception of the interrelations of the manuscripts. The correct formula for reconstructing the original *Roland* is that of Theodor Müller: the Oxford text must not be changed except in cases of absolute necessity. In his edition, however, Müller does not adhere to his formula: in some instances, as in the arrangement of strophes xx to xxv, he deviates from the Oxford text without good reason; in others, as in the retention of the "Baligant Episode," he does not deviate, but should do so. The prospective edition will show strict adherence to Müller's formula.—*Twenty minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor H. Craig.

The Association adjourned at 4.30 p. m.

PAPERS READ BY TITLE.

The following papers, presented to the Association, were read by title only:

28. "Stress in *The Wars of Alexander*." By Mr. C. R. Baskervill, of the University of Texas.

[The paper is the beginning of a study of Middle English alliterative metre. The movement in *The Wars of Alexander* is by phrases corresponding to grammatical units, two, sometimes three, to the half-line. Rhythmic stress, due to the accumulation of light syllables and words before the central stress of the phrase, is the general basis of secondary accent, which is irregular. Secondary accent coming after the main stress of the phrase scarcely occurs in the second half-line and is infrequent in the first, appearing oftenest in the first phrase and decreasing in frequency to the end of the line. In the first half-line two strong words may come in the same phrase, and both often alliterate. The presence of these and of pause in the first phrase of the first half-line has caused the development of half-lines with three alliterating stressed words in separate phrases. There is no evidence of a system of four-stressed half-lines in any form. A comparison of the two MSS. of *The Wars of Alexander* confirms these results. The verse types are made up of typical phrase movements.]

29. "On the supposed dramatic character of the *Ludi* in the Great Wardrobe Accounts of Edward III, 1345-1349." By Professor Arthur Beatty, of the University of Wisconsin. [See *The Modern Language Review*, iv, 4.]

[The latest writer on the masque (R. Brotanek, *Die Englischen Maskenspiele*, 1902), following Warton and Collier, interprets the entries *ad faciendum ludos* as referring to dramatic representations. It is the contention of this paper that they are rather hastiludes, or tournaments: (1) It is antecedently improbable that Edward III should have had dramatic entertainments on important occasions. His favorite amusement was the tournament, the holding of which was a royal prerogative (Rymer, *Fœdera*). (2) *Ludus* means "game," "disport," as well as "dramatic representation." (3) The articles charged to the account of the *ludi*—*viseres*, *crestes*, *capita draconum*, *tunicæ*, etc.—are just such articles as make up the requirements for the tournament. None of the above mentioned

authors have taken full account of all the entries. (4) We have evidence that unmasking and dancing with the ladies was a part of the tournament at least as early as 1450.—These considerations go to prove that these wardrobe accounts do not prove the existence of dramatic representations as early as the middle of the fifteenth century.]

30. "Is a New *Laokoon* Needed?" By Professor Samuel P. Capen, of Clark College.

[Lessing endeavored to define the boundaries between poetry and painting. A tendency similar to the one which he strove to correct prevails to-day. The Symbolistic poets are attempting to find *literary* expression for something which can be more adequately expressed by music, while modern musicians are seeking *musical* expression for what is strictly poetic material.]

31. "Barthélemy du Chastel, Archdeacon of Avignon." By Dr. John L. Gerig, of Columbia University.

[This personage, who has been confused by Christie, Mugnier, Tilley, Buche, and others with Pierre du Chastel, was a native of Nice. Having acquired fame as a jurisconsult and antiquarian, he was appointed, about 1530, Archdeacon of Avignon. In 1533, Card. Bembo wrote him a letter of congratulation on his discovery of the supposed tomb of Laura. In dedicating a volume of poems to du Chastel, Voulte speaks very highly of his library and other collections, which, it seems, were widely known in France. Du Chastel was on terms of friendship with many of the important personages of his time. This article contains eight inedited Latin letters addressed to him by Jean de Pins, Bishop of Rieux, and Antoine Arlier.]

32. "The Relation of Thought and Language." By Professor Theodore W. Hunt, of Princeton University.

[An open question, linguistic and psychological. The importance of correct views on the subject. Room for independent judgment.—Examination of Theories—Müller's Theory of Identity; Whitney's Theory of Conventionality. Statement and confirmation of the true theory of Vital Interaction.—Inferences from the discussion:—That the study of language is a mental discipline. It has special application to the study of spoken tongues. It throws light on the relation of language and literature. The bearing of the subject on the probable future of English. Proposed universal languages in the light of this subject: Esperanto.]

33. "The History of French Fable Manuscripts." By Dr. George C. Keidel, of the Johns Hopkins University. [See *Publications*, xxiv, 2.]

[The history of French fable literature in the Middle Ages still remains to be written, and as yet only a small portion of the whole field has been thoroughly investigated. In the present paper it is intended to enumerate as many French fable manuscripts as possible, and to trace their history, if may be, back to the Middle Ages. The evidence which we may bring to bear on this problem is of three sorts: (1) the extant manuscripts themselves; (2) the constructive manuscripts inferred from internal evidence; and (3) the descriptions found in Medieval catalogues, inventories, and accounts.]

34. "The Fisher King in the Grail Romances." By Professor William A. Nitze, of the University of California. [See *Publications*, xxiv, 3.]

[The Non-Christian elements in the Fisher King.—Ancient analogues to the character.—Possibility that the Grail "ritual" represents a cult similar to the Greek and Roman mysteries.]

35. "The Supernatural in American Literature." By Professor Arthur Hobson Quinn, of the University of Pennsylvania. [To appear in *Publications*, xxv, 1.]

[The supernatural found in American literature principally in the lyric, the romance, and the short story,—occasionally in the epic and the drama. Charles Brockden Brown and realistic supernaturalism. Phases treated by Poe in (a) the lyric, (b) the short story. His methods. Phases treated by Hawthorne. His methods. His sources in tradition and his connection with Calverley. His development of the supernatural ideas in his series of unfinished romances. The concrete symbol as used by Poe and Hawthorne in establishing a supernatural atmosphere; Longfellow's treatment of the supernatural in the epic and the drama. Poe's influence on later writers, especially on Fitz-James O'Brien. O'Brien's treatment of the unseen supernatural. Hawthorne's influence. Conclusion.]

36. "A Note on Marlowe's Dramatic Technique." By Professor Martin Sampson, of Cornell University.

[Dramatic values in *Tamburlaine*; various ways of expressing incident and character; wherein Marlowe fails to seize dramatic possibilities and uses epic method; statement of Marlowe's early scene-formula; comment on possible Senecan influence.]

37. "Some Changes now Going on in English." By Professor C. Alphonso Smith, of the University of North Carolina.

[Most discussions of changes in language confine themselves to changes in vocabulary. New words, however, do not constitute vital changes. Such changes are structural. They affect the inner forces of a language and are the product of its working powers. Grammars record the fixed but omit the transitional. The latter, however, are far the most interesting and significant. Illustrations adduced.]

38. "English for Engineers." By Professor Wilbur Owen Sypher, of Delaware College.

[Starting with some definite observations in regard to the general weakness in English of so many of our Engineering graduates, the writer of this paper will point out first certain causes of this inefficiency, such as lack of good home influences, weakness of preparation in the secondary schools, comparatively little training in composition in college, narrowness of the course of study, and rather general unconcern on the part of instructors other than those in the English Department. After this preliminary statement of the problem, an attempt will be made to answer the question: What constitutes the essential equipment in English of an engineer? The main idea of the paper will then be presented,—the possibility of better training in English during the college course. Among the considerations which will be offered for the criticism of fellow teachers are (1) that the work in English in each college must be adapted more closely than is probably now being done to the actual needs of its own students; (2) that there must be greater insistence in Freshman English on accuracy in the fundamentals, such as spelling, punctuation, sentence structure; (3) that some training in the later years of the course is in almost every case an absolute essential, and that this training may be acquired in general composition work, or in a special course in English dealing with Engineering subjects, or by the correlation of the work in English and in Engineering by means of criticism by English instructors of practically all the written work in the technical courses of instruction. To give an even more practical bearing to the discussion, the writer will show how the English Department of Delaware College, with the helpful coöperation of the Department of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, is attempting in a small way to solve this problem of English for engineering students.]

THE CENTRAL DIVISION MEETING.

The fourteenth annual meeting of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America was held at the Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill., December 28, 29, and 30, 1908.

All the sessions were held in the Northwestern University Building, Lake and Dearborn Streets, Chicago. Professor Oliver Farrar Emerson, Chairman of the Central Division, presided at all.

FIRST SESSION, MONDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2.15 p. m.

IN BOOTH HALL.

The Chairman appointed the following committees:

(1) To nominate officers: Professors P. H. Grumann, Carl Schlenker, W. H. Hulme.

(2) To recommend a place for the next annual meeting: Professors E. P. Baillot, A. R. Hohlfeld, C. G. Dunlap.

(3) To prepare resolutions on the late Professor G. E. Karsten: Professors J. T. Hatfield, G. T. Flom, A. G. Canfield.

Reading and discussion of papers:

1. "Repetition in Chaucer and Shakespeare." By Dr. Eleanor Prescott Hammond, Chicago.

[The difference in treatment of Chaucer and Shakespeare, by students as well as by the general reader, is unwarranted; Chaucer should be viewed as poet and narrative artist, not merely as an exponent of fourteenth-century social conditions. A study of the unlikeness between the narrator and the dramatist, in their range

and in their choice of subjects, can easily blind us to their many resemblances as storytellers. Certain psychological traits, common to all who narrate, can be found in both men; for instance, repetition. Especial allowance must be made for this peculiarity in the earlier storyteller, and it is a question how far the appearance of repetition can be used as evidence for the relative dates of works in which it occurs,—either in Chaucer or in Shakespeare.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor A. H. Tolman.

2. “The Bleeding Lance, the Grail and Irish Saga.” By Professor Arthur C. L. Brown, Northwestern University. [To appear in *Publications*, xxv, 1.]

[This paper investigated primarily the origin of the bleeding lance, seen by Percival at the grail castle. It studies Irish parallels to the lance story, and seeks in this way to throw some new light on the larger question of the origin of the grail legend.—*Twenty minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professors G. O. Curme, W. H. Hulme, O. F. Emerson, and the author.

3. “Were the Coventry Pageants Stationary or Processional?” By Miss Frances Campbell Berkeley, University of Wisconsin.

[This paper suggested that the pageants at Coventry may be divided into two classes: stationary and processional. Special pageants arranged for a royal visit or like occasion belonged in the main to the former class; the Corpus Christi plays to the latter. Evidence in support of this view is adduced; and it is suggested further that the processional character of the English cycles arose from their connection with the Corpus Christi festival, in which a procession was always a prominent feature.—*Twenty minutes.*]

4. “Wilhelm Heinse and the Romantic School.” By Dr. Josef Wiehr, University of Illinois.

[Wilhelm Heinse and the Romantic School. Heinse represents one phase of the transition from the Storm and Stress to the Romantic School. Both proclaim art the most worthy pursuit and

the only way to the fullest enjoyment of life. The solution of moral problems Heinse sees in the unhindered exercise of the natural instincts; the Romanticists place the stress on affinity, of which an intellectualized passion forms the complement.—*Twenty minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor H. B. Lathrop, and the author.

5. "Contemporary Estimates of the *Gettysburg Address*." By Professor Daniel Kilham Dodge, University of Illinois.

[1. Text. Publication by the Associated Press and by special correspondents. Incorrect reports by some of the latter. Reports of the ceremonies. 2. Original titles reported, variety of. 3. Newspaper comments, in the main favorable; absence of in prejudiced journals. Appreciations by Longfellow, Everett. References immediately after Lincoln's death. Holland, Greeley (1866). 4. No general agreement about the merits of the Address during Lincoln's lifetime. Of the favorable comments few approach the modern attitude.—*Five minute abstract.*]

6. "The Historical Drama in the French Literature of Louisiana." By Mr. Edward J. Fortier, University of Illinois.

[The earliest drama, *Poucha-Houmma* by de Villenfre. A brief survey of the development of the drama. A comparison of *Les Martyrs de la Louisiana* by Lussan and of *France et Espagne* by Canonge. Conclusion.—*Ten minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor H. B. Lathrop, Dr. A. de Salvio, and the author.

SECOND SESSION, MONDAY, DECEMBER 28, 8 p. m.

IN BOOTH HALL.

Address of welcome, by Dean Thomas F. Holgate, Northwestern University.

Address of the Chairman of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America, Professor

Oliver Farrar Emerson, Western Reserve University, on "The American Scholar and the Modern Languages."

Immediately after the addresses an informal reception was held in the Library of the Law School.

THIRD SESSION, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 9 a. m.

IN BOOTH HALL.

7. "Notes on the Don Quijote." By Professor Frank Otis Reed, University of Wisconsin.

[Some sources of allusions in prologue to be found in Lope de Vega; new interpretations of a few passages; syntactical notes.—*Ten minutes.*]

8. "The Meaning of Law in Language." By Professor George Philip Krapp, University of Cincinnati. [See *University Studies*, iv, 3, published by the University of Cincinnati.]

[The need of a definition of the conception of law in language; the notion of language as possessing a native and inherent system of law; language as an organism; descriptive generalization as law. Causal law in the natural and mental sciences; will never present in physical activity, but always present in mental activity; every language process a volitional process; some of the volitional laws of language. The question of justice in language and of the right attitude to assume towards the laws of language.—*Twenty minutes.*]

This paper was discussed by Professors F. A. Blackburn, H. B. Lathrop, Dr. J. Wiehr, and the author.

9. "Geibel's Nachahmung der *Banks and Braes o' Bonnie Doon*." By Professor Otto Heller, Washington University.

[This paper demonstrated that the setting of Geibel's political elegies was suggested by the *Natureingang* of one of Burns's love songs. The unfitness of the device for the altered use for which it

is set in motion proves instructive in regard to one of the less familiar manifestations of lyric nature-sense. A species of inverse relation between nature and poet was discust.—*Ten minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor J. T. Hatfield and the author.

10. "Browning and the Marathon Race." By Professor John William Cunliffe, University of Wisconsin. [See *Publications*, xxiv, 1.]

[Was there a Marathon race before 1896 A. D.? The story as told by Herodotus. Later traditions. What authorities did Browning use for *Pheidippides*? His additions and use of his material.—*Twenty minutes.*]

11. "The Meaning of Walther's *Spruch* 82, 11-25 (ed. Wilmanns²). By Professor Starr Willard Cutting, University of Chicago.

[The paper offered a natural interpretation of a passage of Walther von der Vogelweide, which has been regarded hitherto as doubtful. The argument is based upon the relation of the *Spruch* in question to *Spruch* 104, 7-22, upon the significance of the phrase, *Gulden Katzen*, and upon the nature of the joke expressed in the passages just mentioned.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor J. T. Hatfield and the author.

12. "The Versification of Tennyson's Early Poems." By Professor J. F. A. Pyre, University of Wisconsin.

[Summary of the changes in Tennyson's style from 1829 to 1842. The maturing of his blank verse is shown by a comparison of *Timbuctoo*, *The Lover's Tale*, 1833 and 1879, and the two versions of *Oenone*, 1833 and 1842. The progressive standardization of metres and strophes in the volumes of 1830, 1833, and 1842.—*Twenty minutes.*]

13. "Poetry and the Practical Man." By Professor Harry Torsey Baker, Beloit College. [See *The Forum*, September, 1909.]

[Although the practical business man's opinions of poetry may not be of final value, they will often be found suggestive. Excessive devotion to form is disliked by most practical readers, for the reason that it generally results in mere "pretty writing." In contrast, it is important to note how the familiar, informal methods and the ruggedness and realism of Kipling appeal to such readers. Tennyson and his school, in most of their work, fail to meet Arnold's requirement: "The noble and profound application of ideas to life is the most essential part of poetic greatness." But Browning, in spite of the obscurity of some of his productions, will probably appeal more and more to practical men because of his evident sanity and vigor and his wonderfully suggestive interpretations of the moral struggle of life. Moreover, he meets the insistent modern demand for rigid truth of substance, which is as fundamental in poetry as elsewhere. Shakspeare obviously attracts not only the practical reader but all others.—*Twenty minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professors J. F. A. Pyre, F. A. Blackburn, J. M. Clapp, J. S. Clark, F. G. Hubbard, F. H. Chase, J. T. Hatfield, D. K. Dodge, O. F. Emerson, Dr. R. A. Law, and the author.

On motion of Professor Daniel Kilham Dodge the following greeting was unanimously adopted and telegraphed to the Modern Language Association of America in session at Princeton, N. J.:—

The members of the Central Division, meeting in Chicago, extend to the parent body hearty congratulations on the completion of a quarter of a century of increasingly successful endeavors.

At half-past twelve on Tuesday, December 29, the members of the Central Division were the guests of the Northwestern University at luncheon in Assembly Hall.

FOURTH SESSION, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 2.15 p. m.

This session was devoted to three departmental meetings, representing English, Germanic, and Romance languages and literatures. Subjects of importance to the

advancement of instruction were discust. The meetings were held in the places indicated under the respective headings.

ENGLISH.

IN BOOTH HALL.

Chairman—Professor Francis Adelbert Blackburn, University of Chicago.

1. In accordance with a resolution adopted at the last meeting of the English section the consideration of "The Undergraduate Curriculum in English Literature" was continued. The paper on this subject presented at that time by Professor Frank G. Hubbard, University of Wisconsin, was printed in the *Publications* of the Association, Vol. xxiii, pp. 254-268. Professor Hubbard read an abstract of this paper. The discussion was quite general and fruitful.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

IN HURD HALL.

Chairman—Professor Bert John Vos, Indiana University.

The chairman made a statement concerning "A Plan for an Exchange of Teachers between Prussia and the United States" under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Professor Max Batt discust a "Deutscher Dichter Gedächtnis-Stiftung."

Director Max Griebisch spoke of the "Lehrmittelausstellung" of the German-American Teachers' Seminary, of Milwaukee, and generously offered to loan parts of the same to teachers.

The program was then continued in accordance with the original arrangement as follows:

1. "The Inefficient Command of Spoken German by Students who have completed the Elementary Courses in High School and College Classes." Discussion introduced by Professor Carl Schlenker, University of Minnesota.

2. "How can we best teach the Use of the Subjunctive of Indirect Discourse?" Discussion introduced by Professor Starr Willard Cutting, University of Chicago.

3. "The Use of Cognates in the Elementary Teaching of German." Discussion introduced by Professor Bert John Vos, Indiana University.

Chairman Vos invited Professor Charles Bundy Wilson to preside during the reading of the last paper.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

IN HOYNE HALL.

Chairman—Professor Raymond Weeks, University of Illinois.

1. "A Critical Survey of the Opportunities for the Study of Romance Languages in Europe and America." By Professor Frank Otis Reed, University of Wisconsin.

2. A discussion of the following questions: (a) What should be the maximum size of beginning classes in a foreign language? (b) How many hours per week of classroom work should be required of an instructor? By Professor Stephen H. Bush, State University of Iowa.

Professor Hugo P. Thieme was appointed a committee to report at the next departmental meeting on the "possibility of issuing a leaflet of general advice to graduate

students in the Romance languages as to residence at American and European universities."

Immediately after the adjournment of the departmental meetings Dr. H. S. V. Jones, University of Illinois, called a meeting of all interested persons, and an Illinois Branch of the American Folk-Lore Society was organized.

Tuesday evening, December 29, the gentlemen of the Central Division met at the University Club, No. 116 Dearborn Street, where a smoke talk was given by Professor James Taft Hatfield, Northwestern University.

FIFTH SESSION, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 9 a. m.

IN BOOTH HALL.

The committee appointed to nominate officers presented the following nominations:

For Executive Committee: Otto Heller, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Charles Graham Dunlap, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas; Hugh Allison Smith, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

These gentlemen were unanimously elected for one year.

For Chairman the committee nominated Professor Raymond Weeks, University of Illinois, but this gentleman requested that his name be withdrawn, whereupon the committee nominated Professor Arthur Graves Canfield, University of Michigan, who was unanimously elected Chairman for 1909.

For Secretary the committee recommended that Professor Charles Bundy Wilson, State University of Iowa, be reëlected, and the committee recommended further that, in order to give continuity to the plans and the work of

the Secretary, the reëlection be for four years. These recommendations were unanimously adopted, and Professor Wilson was thereupon declared reëlected Secretary for a term of four years, 1909-1912.

The Secretary was authorized to select a committee of three on publicity to act with him for one year. The following were chosen to serve in that capacity: Paul H. Grumann, University of Nebraska; Daniel Kilham Dodge, University of Illinois; Philo M. Buck, Jr., McKinley High School, St. Louis, Mo.

The committee on place of meeting recommended the acceptance of the invitation of the State University of Iowa to hold the next annual meeting at Iowa City, Iowa. The invitation was unanimously adopted.

The committee appointed to prepare resolutions on the late Professor Karsten presented the following:

We pause to pay a tribute to the memory of our beloved friend and associate, Gustaf E. Karsten, whose genial presence was gratefully felt at our last annual meeting, and who died soon after the close of that session.

No formal words can add to the honor which this consistent and faithful life has earned, a life supremely devoted to the advancement of science, and which has left behind it a rich inheritance for our whole nation. Our colleague showed a simple greatness which enlarged our ideal of the dignity and excellence of scholarship. His heroic faith and devotion overcame every hindrance, yielded to no discouragement, and were crowned by worthy achievement.

We honor him not only as a great scholar, who extended the bounds of knowledge, but as a great soul, full of faith and courage, generous in his recognition of all good work on the part of his fellows.

To his loyal wife, always helpful to the great aims of her husband, and to his children, we offer our heartfelt sympathy.

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD,
ARTHUR G. CANFIELD,
GEORGE T. FLOM,
Committee.

These resolutions were unanimously adopted by a standing vote, and the Secretary was instructed to have them spread on the records and to send an engrossed copy to Mrs. Karsten. [A copy was later forwarded to Mrs. Karsten.]

On motion of Professor A. R. Hohlfeld the following resolution with reference to the bereavement of Professor W. H. Carruth in the loss of his wife was unanimously adopted, and Professor C. G. Dunlap, his colleague, was requested to convey a copy to Professor Carruth:

The members of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America in annual convention assembled in Chicago, December 30, 1908, send their greetings and the assurance of sincere sympathy to Professor W. H. Carruth, a leader among the founders of the Central Division and ever since one of its most loyal supporters.

On motion of Professor Daniel Kilham Dodge the following vote of thanks was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the warm thanks of the members of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America be extended to Northwestern University for its generous hospitality in connection with the fourteenth annual meeting, to the success of which the kindly energy of the local committee has so materially contributed.

For the information of the Central Division Professor John William Cunliffe presented the following report:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE REPRODUCTION OF EARLY TEXTS.

The Association at its last joint meeting appointed Professors Cunliffe (Wisconsin), Gayley (California), Kittredge (Harvard), Manly (Chicago), and Todd (Columbia) as a Committee to promote:—(1) the acquisition of photographic reproductions of early texts in modern European languages by American University Libraries; (2) the circulation of index cards of reproductions so

acquired; (3) the cataloguing of original texts prior to 1660 in public and private libraries in the United States and Canada. With regard to the first aim here set forth, the Committee has confined itself to spreading information as to how photographic reproductions can be obtained, leaving the responsibility of ordering them to the libraries or individuals interested. The main energies of the Committee have been given to arranging for the publication of index cards of reproductions at present in American libraries and acquired from time to time. Some difficulty was experienced at the outset as to what texts should be included in the scheme, and after consultation with Mr. William C. Lane, Librarian of Harvard University, it was decided to restrict its scope to the following classes:—

A. Reproductions of manuscripts

1. Published commercially in a considerable number of copies.
2. Reproduced in single or very few copies, on individual orders.

B. Reproductions of early printed texts, reproduced in single or very few copies on individual orders.

Reproductions of early printed texts printed commercially in a considerable number of copies were, after careful consideration, excluded, on the ground that their inclusion would add greatly to the cost of the index cards without proportionately increasing their usefulness. A sufficient number of subscriptions was obtained by the Committee to induce the American Library Association to undertake the printing of the index cards, and the Committee wishes to express its indebtedness to the A. L. A. Publishing Board and its officials for the kindly and helpful interest they have taken in the project. It is hoped that further subscriptions to the series of index cards will be obtained, as in course of time this will prove of substantial assistance to those engaged in research work in the modern European languages. The cards are issued by the A. L. A. Board at cost price, about three cents a title (two cards each). The expense of subscribing for the titles now in hand will not be more than \$3.00, and the annual amount is likely to be less than that for many years to come.

The reading and discussion of papers were then resumed.

14. "The Staging of the Court Drama up to 1595."
By Dr. Anna Helmholtz-Phelan, University of Minnesota.
[See *Publications*, xxiv, 2.]

[This paper aimed to set forth briefly the management of court entertainments, especially dramas, by the Revels Office under the direction of the master of the Revels, and dealt therefore with the staging, the actors, the properties used in the presentation of the plays, and the times and places of performance. A study had been made of such dramas as are extant, in connection with the Revels documents as compiled by Feuillerat, in order to determine as nearly as is possible how the plays were staged. Chief attention was given to the Court Drama in the age of Elizabeth.—*Ten minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professors J. W. Cunliffe, H. B. Lathrop, and the author.

15. "The Boulogne Manuscript of the *Chevalerie Vivien*." By Professor Raymond Weeks, University of Illinois. [To appear in *The Modern Language Review*, 1910.]

[The *Chevalerie Vivien* of Boulogne is part of a cyclic manuscript dated 1295. The Boulogne version stands alone against the other manuscripts, and is unique in many ways. While many of its divergences may well be the personal work of one remanieur, there remain others which are very ancient and which oblige us to class this manuscript among the most valuable preserved of the poem.—*Ten minutes.*]

16. "An Eighteenth Century Attempt at a Critical View of the Novel,—*Bibliothèque Universelle des Romans*." By Professor John Mantel Clapp, Lake Forest College. [To appear in *Publications*, xxv, 1.]

[Systematic criticism of prose fiction began to be attempted in the later eighteenth century, in England, and, to a greater degree, in France. In France the novel-reading public supported several elaborate collections of novels and tales, international in range, and accompanied by more or less critical comment, of which the largest was the *Bibliothèque Universelle des Romans*, published between 1775 and 1789, in 224 volumes of about 250 pages each. This collection, though marred by inaccuracy and inconsistency, shows a surprising catholicity of interest in the art of fiction.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professors F. C. L. van Steenderen, A. C. L. Brown, and the author.

17. "The Bicentennial of Albrecht von Haller." By Professor Julius Goebel, University of Illinois.

[The importance of a more thorough study of the pre-classic writers. Some of the principal poetic ideas and aesthetic problems of the classical period as foreshadowed in Haller's poetry. His conception of poetry and its influence on Schiller. Haller and Goethe.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor J. T. Hatfield.

18. "Celtic Stories in the Basque Country." By Dr. Philip Warner Harry, Northwestern University.

[The fairy stories which form such an interesting and important part in the folk-lore of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales are current among the Basques. It is known that the Celts, at a very early period, overran a large part of the Spanish peninsula. The influence of the foreigner in the Basque region has been slight. It would seem possible, therefore, that these Celtic stories are traditional and not a late importation.—*Twelve minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Dr. A. de Salvio, Professors A. C. L. Brown, E. C. Roedder, and the author.

19. "The Liturgic Easter Drama." By Professor Neil C. Brooks, University of Illinois.

[New source-material. Discussion of a few points concerning the *Quem Quaeritis*. Did the fully developed religious plays influence the liturgic drama in the *Commemoratio Resurrectionis* or elsewhere? Liturgic drama and medieval art. The Marys at the sepulchre with thurible instead of ointment box in art not due to drama. Influence of drama upon art as seen in a paten at Wilten in Tyrol.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor S. W. Cutting and the author.

20. "Resuscitation in Popular Literature: a Chapter in the Study of Popular Tale, Ballad, and Drama." By Professor Arthur Beatty, University of Wisconsin.

[Resuscitation of the dead is practically a constant in the English St. George plays; is widely spread in the popular tale; but seldom

occurs in the popular ballad. The belief in the possibility of resuscitation is very common among peoples of a low stage of culture, and forms the central rite in a great body of ceremony and ritual. The bearing of these facts on the problem of literary origins.—*Twenty minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor A. H. Tolman.

SIXTH SESSION, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 2.15 p. m.

IN BOOTH HALL.

21. "Origin of the *Légende du beau Pécopin et de la belle Bauldour*." By Professor Arthur Graves Canfield, University of Michigan.

[In the prefatory remarks by which the legend is introduced Hugo says: "Je vous avais promis quelqu'une des légendes fameuses du Falkenburg, peut-être même la plus belle, la sombre aventure de Guntram et de Liba. Mais j'ai réfléchi. A quoi bon vous conter des contes que le premier recueil venu vous contera, et vous contera mieux que moi?" And he adds that the legend that follows is not to be found in any collection, but was written under the shadow of the walls of the ruined castle, at the dictation of the trees and winds and birds. But in the manuscript of *le Rhin*, in chapters IV, V, and VI of the legend, the names of the hero and heroine were first written Guntram and Liba. It appears then that he really started out to tell the legend of Falkenburg, but after he had begun it, finding his fancy running away with his material, or for some other reason, he changed his plan, but retained what he had written, composing a new beginning, the present chapters I, II, and III.—*Ten minutes.*]

22. "Hauptmann's View-Point in *Und Pippa tanzt*." By Professor Paul H. Grumann, University of Nebraska. [See *Poet Lore*, xx, 2.]

[In this paper an attempt was made to interpret *Und Pippa tanzt* with special reference to the technique of *Hannele* and *Die versunkene Glocke*. An analysis of several current interpretations formed the basis of the study. Incidentally Goethe's influence upon Hauptmann received attention.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor G. O. Curme and the author.

23. "*Le Joyeux Mistere des Trois Rois, par Jehan d'Abundance.*" By Professor David Hobart Carnahan, University of Illinois. [See *The University of Illinois Studies*, October, 1909.]

[A discussion of manuscript 4222, Nouv. acq. fr., Bib. Nat., Paris. This manuscript contains a short unpublished mystery which is a good type of the decadent mysteries of the sixteenth century. The author is little known, but some information as to his life can be obtained from a study of his literary productions, and his connection with the pirate, Captain Jonas (decapitated at Paris by the orders of Francis I). Discussion of the author's life, works, and of his treatment of his subject as compared with that of earlier writers.—*Twenty minutes.*]

24. "Luther's Translation of Job." By Professor Warren Washburn Florer and Mr. E. H. Lauer, University of Michigan, read by Mr. Lauer.

[The paper in full will consist of a comparison of Luther's manuscript of Job and that of the 1545 edition. It will throw further light on the problem of whether the language of the printed form is that of Luther or of the publisher. It will also show that Luther approached the translation of the Bible from a scholarly viewpoint; that his translation was the outcome of a careful linguistic and stylistic study, and that his purpose was not merely one of a religious propagandist, but also to give to the people, in a language they could understand, the results of the scholarly investigations of his time.—*Fifteen minutes.*]

25. "The Relation of Browning's *Luria* to Shakespeare's *Othello*." By Dr. George R. Elliott, University of Wisconsin. [See *Anglia*, xxxii (1909), 1, 2.]

[Influence of *Othello* on *Luria* much greater than generally supposed. Evidence from letters; Browning's mind, while composing *Luria*, was working on *Othello*. Results traced in the text. Structural parallelism shown in connection with certain soliloquies and dramatic situations.—*Ten minutes.*]

This paper was discust by Professor J. W. Cunliffe.

The Central Division adjourned at about half-past four o'clock.

PAPERS READ BY TITLE.

The following papers, presented to the Central Division, were read by title only:

26. "Some Ballad Variants and Songs." By Professor Arthur Beatty, University of Wisconsin. [See *The Journal of American Folk-Lore*, xxii, 83.]

[These eight specimens were collected in 1907 and 1908. No. I is a variant of *Bonny Barbara Allen*. (No. 84 in Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*). No. II is a variant of Child's No. 53 (*The Turkish Lady, or Lord Baitman*), and No. III a variant of Child's No. 4 (*Lady Isabel and the Elf-Knight*). No. IV (*The East Kentucky Hills*) and No. V (*The Returning Soldier*) are Kentucky popular songs. Nos. VI and VII (*The Murder of Mrs. Broughton*, and *The Southern Railroad Wreck*) are the avowed work of a blind minstrel, and are taken from his printed leaflets. No. III is from Wisconsin; the rest are from Kentucky. No. VIII is a fragment.]

27. "Heine's Character as Reflected in his Use of the Adjective." By Dr. James A. Chiles, University of Illinois. [See *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vii, 3, 4.]

[Heine uses to a relatively great extent the adjective. In the use of the adjective he appears above all as egotist and sensualist. Lack of true feeling in his lyrics and insincerity of his *Weltschmerz*.]

28. "Coleridge's Connection with Wordsworth's Theory of Poetry." By Professor Maurice Garland Fulton, Central University of Kentucky.

[The connection between Coleridge and Wordsworth in the theory of poetry set forth in Wordsworth's *Preface* seems to be settled more by general impression than careful investigation. The paper attempts to define clearly the degree of Coleridge's coincidence with the theory at first; to determine the point where Coleridge began to doubt its soundness; and to discuss his later attitude toward it.]

29. "The Manuscripts and Editions of the Saga of Thorstein Vikingsson." By Dr. Chester Nathan Gould, University of Chicago.

[The results of this study are: Reenhjelm's first edition, Upsala, 1680, followed the Upsala ms. R 716. The Latin version in the Upsala ms. R. 708 is the original of the translation in Reenhjelm's second edition, and was made by J. N. Salan. Rafn's edition, Copenhagen, 1829, is not, as he claimed, based wholly on the old vellum folio AM 152, but often on the late paper quarto AM 341. AM 170 paper quarto is not as Rafn stated, parallel with AM 341, but related to Reenhjelm's text. Coll. Kall. 611, Royal Lib. Copenhagen, contains a text which supplements the old vellum fragments in AM 556b quarto. Two groups of mss. must be added to those implied by Rafn, besides a late romantic version. Rafn's readings are often incorrect.]

30. "Goethe und die bildende Kunst." By Professor Charles H. Handschin, Miami University.

[In Leipzig hatte das Winckelmann-Oesersche Evangelium von "der edlen Einfalt und stillen Grösse" bedeutenderen Einfluss als gewöhnlich angenommen. Goethe blieb seinen niederländisch-deutschen Idealen treu. Seine Gotikbewunderung ist nicht eine Frucht Herderschen Einflusses; sie wurde durch Herder nur vertieft. Den grossen germanischen Meistern, Dürer, Rubens, Rembrandt, bleibt er immer treu. Dürer besonders widmet er sich. Exkurse, mit Zeitangaben, zu Goethes Geschmackswandel in Sachen der bildenden Kunst.]

31. "The *Nidrstigningarsaga*." By Mr. George William Hauschild, University of Chicago High School.

[The *Nidrstigningarsaga* is an Old Norse rendering of the *Descensus Christi ad Infernos* (part II. of the pseudo-gospel of Nicodemus). All four of the fragmentary versions induce us to presuppose a common Scandinavian original. Accepting the 13th century ms. of codex AM. 645 as the most complete recension, it would appear, in the absence of any slavish literal adherence to the Latin, as if the author-scribe had transmitted the account from memory and quite independently expanded the story, ingeniously drawing from Norse mythology and canonical writings, thereby giving a curious mixture of pagan and biblical myths. The fusion of these elements has been so affected as to lend to his redaction a certain heroic spirit indigenous to the North].

32. "The Occult Sources of the First Part of Goethe's *Faust*." By Professor A. R. Hohlfeld, University of Wisconsin.

[The attempt is made to prove in detail that the "alchemistic" authors whose study Goethe began in 1768-9 contain an adequate

basis for the magic and spiritism in the early work on Faust, and that there is little or no ground for specific theories based on Swedenborg or Iamblichus. Inferences are drawn in regard to the chronology of Faust and to Goethe's "storm and stress" period.]

33. "The Ten Most Popular Stories of the *Decameron*." By Dr. Florence Nightingale Jones, University of Illinois. [To appear in *Boccaccio and his Imitators*, The University of Chicago Press, 1909.]

[Nearly all the stories of the *Decameron* have been retold in some form or other, as dramas, poems, etc. The popularity of certain stories, as determined by the number of times they have been imitated in the different literatures of Europe, affords an interesting study of popular psychology.]

34. "Contamination as a Conservative Force in Language." By Professor Robert James Kellogg, James Millikin University.

[The paper discusses the different classes of linguistic groupings and presents particularly a grouping to which is assigned the name "contaminative." An attempt is made to show that "contaminative levelling and mixture" is a conservative force in language, and that there is essential identity in the process of linguistic persistence and change.]

35. "Ideals of the College Teacher of Literature." By Dr. William Ellery Leonard, University of Wisconsin.

[The college teacher of literature distinguished from philologist, literary historian, and antiquarian. Danger of dominance of intellectual over spiritual force. The teacher's duties to his subject, the master minds he is to understand and interpret, to his pupils he is to awaken and inspire, to himself he is to keep firm against academic temptations. Causes and remedies.]

36. "Notes on the Problem of Art and Nature." By Professor O. E. Lessing, University of Illinois. [See *Die neue Form*, Dresden, Reissner, 1910. This volume will also contain the substance of the author's paper *On the Principles of Naturalism*; cf. *Publications*, XXIII, p. xxii.]

[The fusion of artistic and non-artistic elements in the aesthetics of Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe. The influence of Winckelmann and Kant. The views of J. E. Schlegel, Herder, Heinse. Speculative versus creative theories. The trend toward purely artistic principles in the nineteenth century.]

37. "The Stability of the Germanic Consonant System." By Professor Eduard Prokosch, University of Wisconsin.

[On the grounds of a phonetic investigation of the more important consonant changes in Indo-European languages, it is shown that it is important to distinguish them not only according to the way and place of articulation but also according to the shape of the tongue in the production of changing consonants. This leads to the result that concerning such changes that may be interpreted as pointing to a language mixture, especially to migrations, the Germanic consonant system is of the utmost stability; also that, phonetically, the present distinction between *centum* and *satem* languages is untenable.]

38. "Elision, Hiatus, and Synalœpha in Early Spanish Verse." By Professor Carl C. Rice, State University of Iowa.

[F. Hanssen's thesis declaring synalœpha absent in early Spanish confirmed. Apparent cases of synalœpha shown by numeric ratios to be very infrequent. An outline of the chronology of hiatus, elision, and synalœpha in early Italian, Provençal, Spanish and Portuguese, with indications of possible or likely inter-influences. The introduction of synalœpha in Spanish verse late in the 14th century probably due to imitation of Italian models.]

39. "Notes on the Language of the Amana Society." By Professor Charles Bundy Wilson, State University of Iowa.

[An attempt to trace and identify some of the peculiar German expressions in use among the members of the Amana Society, the Community of True Inspiration, in Iowa County, Iowa. The ancestors of these people came from Switzerland, Alsace, Hessen, and other parts of Germany, and their language shows interesting speech-mixtures.]

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

DELIVERED ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 28, IN PRINCETON,
N. J., AT THE TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEET-
ING OF THE ASSOCIATION.

BY F. M. WARREN.

A PLEA FOR THE STUDY OF MEDIEVAL LATIN.¹

The cause of medieval Latin literature, the literature of the period which reaches from the arrival of Gerbert at Rheims, about 972, to the appearance of the Divine Comedy, does not require of its advocate tonight any eulogy of the intellectual vigor and correct style of medieval Latinists. We are all aware, sadly aware perhaps, that the highest thought of the Middle Ages found expression in another language than English, French or German. We need not therefore debate an opinion which is universally received. My desire rather is to invite you to consider a particular application of this opinion. Conscious that we cannot yet compass the broad significance of the relations of medieval Latin literature to the vernacular literatures of the Germanic and Romance peoples, I would confine my remarks to outlining the social and mental activity of a single community of those peoples, manifested in the limited period of one generation. It is the population of the valley of the Loire which I would

¹ This paper attempts a sketch of society in central France under Robert the Pious (987-1031), and its activity in the field of secular lyric poetry.

summon before you, of one of its tributaries, the Vienne, especially, a population which, mainly Provençal and subject to the duke of Aquitania, still acknowledged the king of France as its overlord, and constituted with the French of the Center a social unit. And the years in which I would show this community at work include the last decades of the tenth century and the first decades of the eleventh, or approximately the official lifetime of Robert the Pious of France (987-1031) and his vassal, William the Great, fifth duke of Aquitania (990-1030), and seventh count of Poitou. They also cover the reign of the other great retainer of Robert, Richard the Second, duke of Normandy (996-1026).

Shortly after the beginning of the tenth century the conversion of the viking Rollo, and the permanent occupation of the lower course of the Seine by his companions brought the persistent harrying of western France to an end, and prepared the pacification of the country. The Norsemen had been heathen, laying waste church and monastery, the last asylums of Carolingian civilization. While they were ravaging, the fitful raids of the Moslems along the Mediterranean and the guerilla warfare of the feudatories of the Center had seemed but minor evils. But quiet in the North foreshadowed quiet elsewhere. In 972 the Rhone valley saw the Saracens in full retreat. And before this time, about the middle of the century, the year 955 witnessed the turning point of feudal strife. For the army of Hugh the Great, falling back from the walls of Poitiers, attributed the failure of the siege to St. Hilary's anger, aroused by the burning of a monastery in the suburbs.¹ Hereafter superstition aided devotion in

¹ See F. Lot, *Les Derniers Carolingiens*, p. 14; cf. p. 99.—Flooard's *Annales* show the gradual subsidence of Norman inroads

its protection of sanctuaries, and the cause of peace became an immediate beneficiary.

Another result of this campaign of Hugh's was a lasting treaty which the dukes of France and Aquitania signed to their mutual profit in 962, and which may have been strengthened in 970 by Hugh Capet's marriage to Adelaide, a Provençal. In 966 an agreement between Hugh Capet and Richard of Normandy was also entered upon, by which Richard acknowledged Hugh's suzerainty, and both engagements were still in force when Hugh became the rightful overlord of Normandy and Aquitania, through his accession to the throne in 987. The benefits derived from this lessening of raids and forays were so patent that dawning public opinion fostered the idea of a universal peace, and in 988 a plan for a federation of the Catholic states of the Continent seems to have been broached by Hugh and other rulers.¹ This ideal failed of achievement, but in France at least it was partly realized when the death of Herbert of Vermandois (995) and Eudes of Chartres (996) left Foulques Nerra of Anjou the only constant menace to the tranquillity of his neighbors.

It may be, however, that much of the credit for the comparative quiet of the countryside under Robert the

between 919 and 930. None are mentioned after this latter date. The Hungarians, who were a menace to France and Aquitania during the first half of the tenth century, do not appear in Flodoard after 951. In 955 their power was broken by Otto I, whose victory brought peace and the attendant intellectual development to Germany also. The Saracens had seized the Great St. Bernard pass early in the century, and either killed or robbed the English pilgrims who took that way to Rome (see Flodoard, years 921, 923, 940, 951).

¹ F. Lot, *Les Derniers Carolingiens*, pp. 233, 234.—The "Paix de Dieu" was probably suggested at this time by the clergy of Aquitania. See A. Luchaire, in Lavissee, *Histoire de France* II, pp. 133-138.

Pious is due to the final triumph of feudalism. The interdependence of vassal and suzerain, the actual rights of the former to the lands he theoretically held as a gift, the power to transmit these lands to his descendants, these principles, and others which, gradually developed and adjusted, formed the framework of medieval society, had been generally recognized by the middle of the tenth century. They furnish the grounds for Hugh Capet's appeal to his barons, at the crisis of his career, in 981.¹ And, when firmly fixed, they prepared the way for a new conception of humanity. The generation which was first wholly fashioned by them could drop the century-long debate over matters of administration. Relieved of the discussion of methods of government it could devote itself to its social and intellectual welfare. Through contemplation of a new environment the consciousness of a new being was acquired. The heirs to this new estate, glorying in the ideals of life which they had inherited, became eager to proclaim them to others, to give them to mankind as unquestioned truths. And they sought a way of expressing their belief and their emotions.

In this assertion of a nation's creed the communities of religion led. For they profited, the earliest of all social units, by the evolution of the new social organism. They had been sacked by the Normans and exploited by the barons, who had quartered their men-at-arms in their halls and turned the revenue of their acres into their war-chests. The Normans converted, the barons were next to yield. Under the banner of Cluny, whose charter of 910 had absolved it from all secular rule, the monasteries of France and Aquitania entered on a protracted conflict with

¹ Richer, *Historiarum Libri* III, c. 81-83; cf. I, c. 53, 64, II, c. 7, 97, III, c. 11, 13, IV, c. 48, 62; Dido of St. Quentin, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina* CXLII, 694, 702, 755.

their feudal oppressors. The activity of decades was consumed in the strife, but the end justified the effort. One after another the lay abbots gave way to clerical. The exactions of the tax collectors gradually ceased. Before the election of Hugh Capet to the kingship the work had been done. The monasteries, free at last from the fear of plunder and sacrilege, could give themselves to the purposes for which they had been founded. They became centers of devotion and religious training.

An outward sign of the coming of peace and piety to the land is given by the building of convents, abbeys and churches. In the years which intervened between Robert's elevation to the throne in 987 and his death in 1031, new basilicas were erected at Orleans, Tours (St. Martin's), Angoulême, Limoges, Étampes, Poitiers, Dijon, Rennes, Angers and Chartres—to follow their chronological sequence,—many monasteries were reconstructed and various chapels were endowed. The new churches were larger than the old. Stone arches and vaultings took the place of wood, dangerously inflammable. The plans for some of them had been drawn by artists attracted from Italy, and Italian artisans also looked after their ornamentation. Into these more substantial and more pleasing monuments flowed the gifts of the faithful. Gold crucifixes, statues of gold, shrines studded with gems, gold and silver Scripture covers, embroidered silk altar cloths, especially for the Virgin's altar, bore witness to the affluence which commerce following in the train of peace had brought. In this new birth of the eleventh century we mark that leaven of Italian art and architecture which was to show itself later at the beginning of the sixteenth.¹

¹ Adémar de Chabannes, *Chronicon* III, c. 49, 51, 56, etc.; Raoul Glaber, *Historia* II, c. 4, 5, III, c. 4, etc., *Vita S. Guilelmi*, *passim*; Helgaud of Fleury, *Epitoma Vitae Roberti*; André of Fleury, *Vita*

Awakening religious zeal found still further means of gratification. Quick to take advantage of the general enthusiasm for holy things, bishops vied with abbots in exalting the importance of their charges. The healing power of relics was confidently proclaimed, and measures were taken to heighten their sanctity. The discovery of a part of Moses' rod at Sens, which brought to that city a goodly influx of worshippers from all western Europe, and incidentally made Sens and its see opulent, prepared the way for the appearance of John the Baptist's head a year or two later (1010), at St. Jean d'Angély, at the opportune moment of the return of William of Aquitania from his customary pilgrimage to Rome. Some contentious minds there were who scouted the genuineness of this treasure, but the visit of Robert and his queen to the sacred spot, of the king of Navarre, the duke of Gascony, the count of Champagne, not to mention princes and bishops, abbots and magistrates, French, Provençals, Spaniards and Italians, speedily drove the petty critics to cover. For if the head were not the real one, the gifts showered on the fortunate abbey which could boast of it rang true. The age demanded memorials of the martyred dead, or at least the communities of religion did, and the demands were wonderfully supplied. Indeed, did not an Italian antiquarian guarantee, towards 1025, to furnish talismans to all believers? Nor may we suppose that he manufactured them, for the ancient tombs in the valley of the Po proved fairly inexhaustible.¹

Gauzlini (in *Neues Archiv* III, pp. 353, 356, 359, 363-367, 375-379); *Chroniques de Saint-Martial de Limoges*, pp. 5, 6, 8, 42, 43; *Chroniques des Églises d'Anjou*, pp. 257, 258; *Miracles de Saint-Benoît*, pp. 128, 129, 209, 217, 276; *Chronicon S. Benigni Divion.* (in Migne, *Patrologia Latina* CXXI, 856-860, 862); Bernard of Angers, *Miracula S. Fidis*; A. Luchaire, in Lavissee, *Histoire de France* II, pp. 199-201.

¹ Raoul Glaber, *Historia* III, c. 6, IV, c. 3; Adémar de Chabannes,

To us of the present day it seems somewhat suggestive that this unearthing of relics under Robert and William should coincide with a sudden expansion of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Could the law of competition have been operative here, and may we suspect the local oratories of attempting to rival the Holy Sepulcher? Down to the first decade of the eleventh century the usual trip to Palestine had been mainly made by water. It was perilous in the extreme and very costly. But when the king of Hungary, under his baptismal name of Stephen, had waged what might be called a war of religion against his adversaries, and bringing peace to his realm had unified it, a land route was opened. By every means in his power the royal convert favored the passing of pilgrims through his territories. He furnished them freely with provisions and even gave them clothes and money. So that the very poor could now aspire to the great blessing. "Wherefore," as the chronicler tells us, "an innumerable multitude of both nobles and commoners set out for Jerusalem." It was towards the year 1008 that this change took place. For two seasons the tide swelled on. Then Hakem, the Moslem ruler of Syria, taking alarm at so surprising a flood of Occidentals strove to allay it by removing its objective point. He razed the Church of the Holy Sepulcher to its foundation stones.

In France, at least, this violent act of desecration seems to have been rightly interpreted. They said at Orleans that the Jews of the region had warned Hakem against a coming invasion of armed Christians. At once a fierce persecution of the supposed informers broke out. The

Chronicon III, c. 56; Helgaud, *Epitoma Vitae Roberti* (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* CXLII, 928). The monks of St. Jean d'Angély were still claiming their relic in 1109. See G. de Nogent, *Gesta Dei* (Migne, o. c. CLVI, 695).

Jews of the Loire valley were murdered, drowned or exiled. Hardly did the terrified remnants of the unfortunate race find a bleak refuge in forest coverts. For five years none dared show themselves in town or village. In 1017, through some unaccountable veering of opinion, Hakem rebuilt the church, and the arrested stream of pilgrims resumed its course.¹

The religious exaltation of the generation of Robert the Pious did not exhaust itself at all with frequent journeyings to consecrated shrines. It found other vents, beneficent or harmful. Heresies appeared. Here and there crazed zealots began to deny the authority of the Church and inveigh against its formal rites, scattered mutterings of the coming storm. In 1022 the pertinacious sect of the Manicheans was discovered in active proselyting at Orleans. Some of the higher clergy were involved, among them the queen's confessor even. The power of the state was invoked, and those who refused to recant, to the number of thirteen, were publicly burned alive. It is said that here the fires of the Inquisition were lighted.²

¹ Raoul Glaber, *o. c.* III, c. 1, 7, IV, c. 6; Adémar de Chabannes, *o. c.* III, c. 47, 55; A. Luchaire, *o. c.*, pp. 78-84; Ch. Pfister, *Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux*, pp. 344-350.—Veneration of relics and the cures they worked were the chief reasons for pilgrimages to European shrines. The great pilgrimages, after Jerusalem, were to Rome and Santiago. Towards the end of the tenth century other localities began to attract large numbers of devotees. In 996 Adalbert, bishop of Prague, visited St. Martin's at Tours, St. Benedict's (Fleury), St. Maur-sur-Loire and St. Denis (Pertz, SS. IV, 592, 604). Bernward of Hildesheim made a pilgrimage in 1006 to St. Denis and St. Martin's (Pertz, *o. c.* IV, 776). Bernard of Angers visited St. Fides', at Conques, three times between 1010 and 1020 (*Miracula S. Fidis*, Lauer's edition, Introduction).

² R. Glaber, *o. c.* II, c. 11, 12, III, c. 8; Adémar de Chabannes, *o. c.* III, c. 49, 59, 69; *Cartulaire de St. Pierre de Chartres*, pp. 109-115; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* CXLII, 1269; *Chronicon St. Petri Vivi Senon.*, in *Recueil des Historiens* X, pp. 223, 224.

But a more acceptable manifestation of piety revealed itself in the growing worship of the Virgin. The pure, submissive figure of Mary had long appealed to the people of central France. Chapels had been dedicated to her, altars built, and now her altars became the especial recipients of gifts. One of the great prelates of the age devoted himself to her praise, and the noble cathedral he erected at Chartres, with the assistance of the rulers of France, Aquitania and even Cnut of England, was a church of Our Lady. Bishop Fulbert also composed hymns in her honor, and as in the religious lyric of the day the Father and the Son were addressed as "Domine," so was Mary, blessed among women, acclaimed as "Domina."¹

Another and quite different idea of society under Robert the Pious and William the Great is afforded by the change in fashions. When Louis of France married Adelaide of Brioude (Haute-Loire), in 981, he assumed the dress of her people and relapsed in his manners. But as he did not carry his clothes or his effeminacy home to France, his example could not contaminate his former countrymen. When, however, the courtiers of Constance of Arles, most frivolous in conduct, we are told, halting in morals, wearing perverted garments and shod most absurdly, inex-

¹ Flodoard often mentions churches of the Virgin in his *Annales*. Maieul of Cluny († 994) was her devotee (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* CXXXVII, 759, 760), and Dunstan of England too: "Non patiatu domina mea, sancta Mater Domini mei" (*Vita S. Dunstani*, in Stubbs' *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, p. 18). Fulbert's contemporary, Stephen of Hungary, vied with him in building churches for her worship (*Vita S. Stephani*, in Migne, o. c. CLI, 1218, 1219). Fulbert extolled the Virgin in various sermons also (Migne, o. c. CXLI, 320 ss, 336 ss).—It is possible that the political power of women at this time, of Adelaide, widow of Otto I, and her daughter, Emma, widow of Lothaire, of Theophano, widow of Otto II, of Beatrice, duchess of Lorraine, Hugh Capet's sister, and of Constance, Robert's queen, may have reacted favorably on the cult of the Virgin.

perienced in war and unskilled in horsemanship, flocked to Orleans and Paris in her bridal train, in 1005, then indeed were the good old times put incontinently to flight. Though the glowing invectives of a Saint William of Dijon did avail in rescuing many from the pit, yet nearly all France that you knew decked itself out in this livery of Satan—and with the assurance of a nucleus of fashionable customers in advance the reprobate barber invaded the Northern capitals, virtuously hirsute.¹

At this turning-point of the eleventh century, then, beliefs and customs were being recast. The material and the spiritual elements of a people's life were being subjected to new tests, to other analyses. And in this general fusing of the past with the future the refining of the intellect was going on. The monasteries, as we have seen, had been restored to their proper functions of piety, industry and education. It is true that the schools they maintained for the training of their own acolytes and the instruction of the young nobles of the neighborhood were of the simplest kind. Reading, writing and reckoning formed the substance of their teaching. The purpose of this primary discipline also was thoroughly didactic. The works of the Church Fathers supplied the text-books. In truth we could not expect communities which had been reformed by Cluny to teach literature. To its abbots Virgil was perdition and Horace purgatory, at the best. Still in the enlightening of the land these pious foundations are not to be overlooked. They were too numerous and their heads were too frequently men of brains, as Abbo of Fleury, whose talents had given him a reputation

¹ Richer, *Historiarum Libri* III, c. 95; Adalberon of Laon, *Carmen ad Robertum Regem*, ll. 97-106 (Migne, o. c. CXXI, 795, 796); R. Glaber, *Hist.* III, c. 9, and *Vita S. Guilelmi*, c. 16. Cf. Othlo of St. Emmeram, *Liber Visionum*, Visio XVII (Migne, o. c. CXLVI, 373).

even in England. Yet conceding to the monasteries all possible merit in the diffusion of knowledge, we cannot make large claims for them in the field of science. The spirit of their discipline was neither progressive nor stimulating. The true renaissance of learning in France was to take place elsewhere, and it is in the cathedrals that its presence was made manifest. When, in 972, the archbishop of Rheims confided the direction of the school he was about to organize for the education of the youth of his diocese to Gerbert, a Provençal monk from Aurillac (Cantal), the foundations of the French university were laid.

Gerbert's ideas of learning were quite different from those which obtained in the religious communities of his day. His purpose was quite the reverse of didactic. He was consumed with a longing for knowledge, and recognized a distinct end in the cultivation of pure literature. Both these goals he steadfastly set before his pupils. The study of the Latin poets of antiquity held a leading place in his curriculum: Virgil, Statius, Terence, Juvenal, Horace, Persius, Lucan. From them he taught the art of rhetoric. They were the models. By imitating their style a correct and elegant Latinity was to be acquired. In his scientific courses books were not the only texts. Description was proven by observation. His classes in astronomy studied the stars in heaven by night, in order to gain a more exact notion of their position relative to the earth.

The revival of learning in the Middle Ages is greatly indebted to Gerbert for his methods of instruction. It profited largely also by his literary taste and the perfection of his Latin style. And it received fresh impetus from his zeal as a collector. You might say that the chief aim of Gerbert's academic career was to form a library of his

own. Whatever the theme of his extensive correspondence, politics, church administration or private business, we often see him slighting his argument in order to beg his friends for one more volume, a Pliny or a Commentary on Terence, a Suetonius or a Statius, a Cæsar or a Boethius, an oration of Cicero's or a treatise on medicine. And many were the scribes he hired to copy distant manuscripts. Clearly Gerbert's whole attitude towards education, the curiosity which impelled him to seek out all kinds of information, the store he set by the authors of ancient Rome, contained all the essential elements of an intellectual revolution. As in the affairs of state so in the matters of the mind. The establishment of the feudal system, the cessation of warfare which accompanied its crystallization, had opened the way for a new conception of man in relation to his surroundings. During the last three decades of the tenth century the cathedral school at Rheims was the intellectual center of Christendom, and the students who gathered in its cloisters received a training and gained an inspiration that was to mould all the schools of which they in turn were to become masters, whether monastic or episcopal.¹

Among Gerbert's pupils was one, an Italian by birth perhaps, who was destined to succeed him in his calling as a teacher and hand his educational ideas down through the classrooms of the eleventh century. Chartres, already favorably known for its cultivation of the arts and medicine, took the place of Rheims as a university center when Fulbert became its bishop (1006-1028), and supplied the

¹ Richer, *Historiarum Libri* III, c. 42-50, 51-54, 56-65, IV, c. 73, etc.; J. Havet, *Lettres de Gerbert*; Aimoin of Fleury, *Vita S. Abbonis* (Migne, o. c. CXXXIX, 387 ss); Ch. Pfister, *Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux*, pp. 9-34; *Constantine of Fleury* (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, July, 1909).

abbeys and cathedrals of western Europe with theologians and teachers. The heads of the schools of Angers, Poitiers, Tours, and Orleans in the Center, and Evreux and St. Riquier in the North, Adelmann of Liège and Brescia, Reginald of Cologne and Olbert of Gembloux were of this second band of scholars which received its training at the hands of Fulbert. More potent than they, however, or than others who might be named, though perhaps exercising no greater authority among his contemporaries, was the Chartres alumnus, Berengar of Tours. His discussion of the doctrine of transubstantiation started the most significant controversy of the age, and marked beyond mistaking the advent of new ways of thought. For it summoned the dogmas of the Church before the judgment seat of reason.¹

With the debate over Berengar's heresy we have passed beyond the limits of the period under consideration, but we have done so purposely, in order to illustrate the real essence of that revolution of the intellect which, beginning in Gerbert's lecture-room, was carried on with equal energy by his academic successor. Together with the other facts that have been cited, whether sociological or religious, this outbreak of freedom of thought, this protest against unquestioned tradition, stamps the reign of Robert the Pious as eventful in the history of the people of France. For these facts taken in their entirety bring before us a nation newly constituted, a society conscious of itself, filled with its own views of the world and man and bent on giving these views utterance. The darkness of war and mental sloth has foreshadowed another dawning. Generations of brutal materialism and indolent bigotry have begot, in the mysterious ways of Providence, a folk which has aspira-

¹ A. Clerval, *Les Écoles de Chartres au moyen âge*, pp. 14-142.

tions and doubts. Are these aspirations and doubts to be formulated? Will the Frenchman of this medieval renaissance express his ideas and emotions as his descendants will hundreds of years later, at the time of the classical new birth?

In the domain of art and architecture we have seen this question plainly answered. In the realm of music an answer may be dimly discerned. In the field of literature alone are we forced to grope our way. Should we pass by, for the moment, the mass of lyric poetry made up of church hymns and sequences, we can trace out hardly any other evidences of literary activity than are afforded by the letters of prelates, the biographies of abbots and bishops, the annals of provinces and convents and the disputations of wrangling ecclesiastics. And to call the greater part of this material literature requires a large exercise of charity. At best it is mainly hortatory and didactic. Eulogies of church dignitaries and the laudation of relics are its mainsprings. Pride of authorship but rarely stands forth as a compelling power. Indeed, in the compositions which have reached us, Fulbert of Chartres is the only known writer of the period who cultivates literature for its own sake. But his works, few in number as they are, fortunately comprise many literary varieties. Besides letters and sermons, we find poems, sacred and secular, sequences and hymns to the Virgin, lines to aid the memory, a jocose narrative in verse, and stanzas to the nightingale. The collection is significant. We would hope that it is typical, and that many of Fulbert's contemporaries may have tried to rival him, on one note at least. But of such emulators barely the name. Even Constantine, pupil and friend of Gerbert, master at Fleury for a time, then abbot of St. Mesmin, near Orleans, and, later, abbot of Nouaillé, near Poitiers, whose songs an old

Rheims comrade likens in style to the manner of Sophocles, and whose verse, and the music which accompanied it, is praised by more than one chronicler, even he, a gifted poet, lives only in scattered allusions.¹

Yet music and song must have stirred hearts in the valley of the Loire under the suzerainty of William the Great and the overlordship of Robert the Pious. Not only do the productions of Fulbert's muse and the lost rhymings of Constantine's indicate this, but these very princes under whom they wrought are always given to us as patrons of letters and trained in the liberal arts. We learn that William, the grandfather of William IX of Poitou, is an admirer of books, the owner of a library to which he would retire when seeking relief from administrative cares, and where he would pass long nights in reading, which conquered sweet sleep. And if he saw any clerk, ornate in wisdom, did he not especially cherish him, even to the bestowal of the abbacy of St. Maixent on one of them, a certain Renaud, surnamed Plato? And when William's daughter, Agnes, became empress of Germany, we find her also imitating her father's example and fostering the pursuit of literature at the imperial court.²

In the center of William's territories, on the banks of the Vienne, a southern tributary of the Loire, stood the old city of Limoges with its abbey of St. Martial's. Whatever may have been the original object of this pious foundation, in the tenth century, at least, the cultivation of music among its monks fairly rivalled their good works. Church hymns they composed in large numbers. Receiv-

¹ Clerval, *o. c.*, pp. 40-43, 111-116; *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy*, July, 1909.

² R. Glaber, *o. c.* II, c. 1; Richer, *o. c.* IV, c. 13; Adémar de Chabannes, *o. c.* III, c. 41, 54; Migne, *o. c.* CXLII, 1369.

ing the sequence and trope as Notker and Tutilo had fashioned them at St. Gall, they adapted the Easter trope to the liturgy of the Nativity and tried to bend the final syllables in the sequence strophe to a monorime (in *a*). The development of rime indeed may have preceded the evolution of parallelism in the sequence, an evolution which seems to have taken place in their circle also. At all events, whether these inventions or improvements in the trope and the sequence are to be attributed to St. Martial's or not, its brethren labored unremittingly and well in the domain of church hymnology, and through their labors Limoges succeeded St. Gall as a source of sacred song. In quality and excellence its sequences rank first among the compositions of the tenth century. As early as 934 a collection of them was made by some scribe of the abbey, in a volume which contains four of Notker's sequences and twenty-one of St. Martial's own. Between 985 and 996 this collection was enlarged into a second edition of one hundred and thirty-nine. Still a third sequence manuscript from St. Martial's belongs to the tenth century, while for the eleventh no less than ten are known, all containing liturgical tropes and hymns as well as sequences. And the other abbeys of Limoges make a further addition of five eleventh-century collections to the existing thirteen of St. Martial's. Such productivity was unique. St. Gall itself can point to but seven volumes.¹

¹ Dreves and Blume, *Analecta Hymnica* VII, XLVII, XLIX; Catalog of St. Martial's Library in 1730, in *Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique du Limousin* XLIII (1895), pp. 1-60.—In *Analecta* XLIX, p. 277, Blume queries as to whether the sequence which he prints there from tenth-century manuscripts, and whose phrases rime in *a*, though without parallelism, is not a specimen of the oldest forms of the alleluja melody which immediately preceded parallelism.—The adaptation of the Tutilo Easter trope, "Quem quaeritis, etc.", to the liturgy of the Nativity appears in a St. Mar-

From St. Martial's of Limoges religious lyric and the sacred drama radiated throughout the abbeys of France. In the South, Moissac, which was already famed for its hymn writing in the tenth century, borrows some of St. Martial's tropes. To the East, Nevers and Cluny answer to its influence. Crossing the Channel its tropes reappear in Winchester manuscripts, and travelling back over the Strait of Dover they enliven the office of St. Vedast's of Arras. And it is not in poetic composition alone that its monks excel. Nearly all of the thirteen St. Martial manuscripts give the musical notation with the hymn.¹

tial manuscript first (*Analecta* XLIX, p. 8), and is therefore to be credited to that abbey. At this time the festival of the Nativity was celebrated in central France with much enthusiasm. It receives mention at Chartres as early as 977 (Clerval, *o. c.*, p. 95, n. 2), and is given great vogue a few decades later by Fulbert. Possibly encouraged by the success of this adaptation—though it soon fell out of the Christmas play—the monks of St. Martial's made in the eleventh century or earlier a similar adaptation to the liturgy for Ascension Day (*Analecta* XLIX, p. 10; C. Lange, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern*, p. 20).

¹ Dreves and Blume, *o. c.* XLVII, XLIX. The connection of Winchester with St. Martial's was probably made at Fleury (Bannister, in *Analecta* XL, p. 9). Unfortunately the Fleury manuscripts of the tenth century are not extant. We know that Odo, archbishop of Canterbury, received his monastic habit from Fleury in 942, that Oswald, bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York, studied at Fleury in 958, and again in 960, that Germanus of Winchester went with Oswald to Fleury in 960 and remained there for a while, and towards 970 paid it another visit of some years duration (*Chronicon Abbatiae Ramesiensis* (Rolls Series), pp. 15, 24, 29, 42, 72, 73). From Fleury, in 986, Abbo was summoned to train the monks of Ramsey, and at Fleury, about this time, Oswald, the nephew of the archbishop, formed a lasting friendship with the poet Constantine (J. Leland, *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis* (London, 1709), c. 138). It must be that the St. Martial's tropes were sung at Fleury while Oswald and Germanus were there, and it is highly probable that these priests, or others whose names have not been handed down to us, carried these tropes with them to England where

We could wish that the influence of St. Martial's in poetry and music might be as clearly seen on the laity of its own parish as it is on its monastic colleagues. The local chronicles afford, to be sure, a few instances of its leadership, but their information is exceedingly meagre. When, for instance, the head of John the Baptist was discovered at St. Jean d'Angély, in 1010, there was an occasion for great popular rejoicing. A solemn procession of the priests and burghers of Limoges bore to St. Jean the bones of St. Martial. And this procession was met on the way by the friars of the town and the population of the whole region, "antiphonas in excelsa voce intonantes." Again, when Géraud had been consecrated bishop of Limoges at St. Hilary's of Poitiers (1012) and had returned to St. Martial's, the brethren of that abbey escorted him and the visiting bishops to the church of St. Peter's. Placed in a chair and raised aloft on the shoulders of citizens, "canonicis antiphonas concinentibus," the new bishop was then carried in triumph to St. Stephen's. In 1026 a similar greeting was given to William Taillefer, count of Angoulême, as he was coming back to his capital from a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulcher. He passed through Limoges, and was honorably entertained at St. Martial's. But afterwards, as he was drawing near to

Dunstan compiled them, perhaps in 967 (Lange, *o. c.*, p. 44). From England and Winchester they would return to the Continent with English pilgrims to Rome, or with wandering students like Oswald, the nephew, who visited St. Bertin's and St. Vedast's. Arras was a station on the way to Rome (W. Stubbs, *Memorials of St. Dunstan* (Rolls Series), pp. 392-395—route of Sigeric of Canterbury in 991), and its abbots remained in relations with the English prelates (letter of Fulrad of St. Vedast's to Ethelgar of Canterbury and Winchester between 988 and 990; Stubbs, *o. c.*, p. 383). Indeed the earliest manuscript of St. Dunstan's life was preserved at St. Vedast's (Stubbs, p. xxvii).

Angoulême, all of his chief vassals from Périgueux and Saintes, together with their people of both sexes and every age, the clergy of St. Eparchius' in white vestments and a great multitude of citizens, clerks and canons met him, "cum laudibus et antiphonis," and entered the town with him to the universal pean of "Te Deum laudamus."¹

Festivals like these were undoubtedly organized by the monks of St. Martial's and other pious foundations, and the singing was lead by the abbey choir. But the monks of Limoges did not restrict their friendly intercourse with its inhabitants to such occasions, few or many. They provided dramatic performances for the laity within the abbey itself. The Easter liturgy was treated by them as Tutilo had treated it at St. Gall. And we have seen how they extended the use of this trope to the office of the Nativity first, and afterwards to Ascension Day. Besides these embryo plays from the tenth century, two longer dramas from the last of the eleventh, the *Magi* and the *Prophets*, have come down to us in a St. Martial manuscript. And the bilingual play of the Virgins, *Sponsus*, was preserved by St. Martial's scribes, though it may have originated in a convent nearer to Angoulême.²

Proofs there are, then, that the monks of St. Martial's were especially interested in poetry and dramatic representation during the tenth and eleventh centuries. Their productions, and the output of the other abbeys of Limoges, as evinced by their scribes, would indicate an active literary life in that ancient town. The widespread influence of St. Martial's also shows how far its standards of composition had permeated France and England. Now if Latin hymns,

¹ Adémar de Chabannes, *o. c.* III, c. 49, 56, 65.

² H. du Méril, *Origines latines du théâtre moderne*, pp. 151, 179 (St. Martial ms. at Paris, Bib. Nat., Latin 1139).

sequences and tropes, together with the music befitting each song, were so much liked and cultivated at this turning-point of the Middle Ages by the clergy of Limousin, it is more than probable that rustic melodies were engaging the attention of ambitious rhymsters among the laity. William of Aquitania, so eulogized as a patron of Latin letters, would hardly have contemned pleasing compositions in his mother tongue. Some of the rulers of his day, as Hugh Capet, could not understand Latin. Their literary entertainments, therefore, must have been confined to the vernacular. It is also true that many dignitaries of the Church were scarcely more learned than Hugh in this particular, and if popular poetry existed we may fancy that they also encouraged it with their favor.¹

Now as to the existence of songs in French and Provençal there can be no question. We have one direct witness to them at this time, though the locality specified lay to the south of William's territories.² Still we cannot tell whether the lyric enthusiasm of St. Martial's monks was a cause or an effect. Did they sing because they belonged to a race of singers, accustomed for ages to give expression to its joys and sorrows, or was the poetic muse revealed to them by some errant brother whom they welcomed to their fold? And pupils of him did they become teachers of their congregations? The former alternative is by far

¹ F. Lot, *Les Derniers Carolingiens*, pp. 249, 308-311; Pertz, SS. III, pp. 658 ss.

² Bernard of Angers, who frequently cites Romance words in his *Miracula S. Fidis* (written shortly after 1020), says that in the saint's church at Conques, while monks were whiling away the night watch for visiting pilgrims with Psalms and vigils, the more restless palmers who did not know the monks' chants would persist in singing Provençal ditties: "Horum vero ignari, tam cantilenis rusticis quam aliis nugis longe noctis solantur fastidium" (II, c. 12; Lauer's edition, p. 120).

the more reasonable. But whatever may be the origin of their lyricism, the services which they rendered to church music in the tenth and eleventh centuries are so great that we are not at all surprised to find Limoges the center of poetry in the vernacular also, and the earliest monuments of literature to the south of the Loire composed in the language of Limousin.

For it is from the region ruled over by William the Great, and perhaps from his times, that the fragment of the translation from Boethius comes, a fragment preserved to us in the single copy made for the abbey at Fleury, where Gerbert's friend, Constantine, had shortly before championed the cause of secular learning against Abbo's narrow bigotry. A few decades after the lines from Boethius, the St. Martial manuscript which contains the Latin plays of the Magi and the Prophets was inscribed with three poems in Provençal: a prayer to the Virgin, a Christmas hymn, and the whimsical protest of a chorister, placed between two Latin sequences, and which declares that the high notes of the sequence, too long continued, had tired the singer's voice. At Limoges also, where they probably had been written, were to be found the original manuscripts from which the prose Gospel of St. John and the Provençal sermons of the early twelfth century, all in the Limousin tongue, had been copied. And a wider circle, whose radii may indeed proceed from Limoges as a focus of inspiration, could include the poem on St. Léger, a former abbot of St. Maixent, near Poitiers, and bishop of Autun, beyond Nevers, not far from Cluny—and both Nevers and Cluny were under St. Martial's influence,—the liturgical *Épître farcie de la St. Étienne*, from Agen, near Moissac, and on the Limoges road—we have seen Moissac borrowing St. Martial's tropes—and the *Chanson de Ste. Foy* of Agen, composed in the diocese of Toulouse

(about 1100), but preserved in a Fleury manuscript which is now at Leyden. The Provençal *Épître farcie de la St. Étienne* is older than its French counterpart of the early twelfth century. It may have been its model, for the French version has come down to us in a single manuscript of the city of Tours, just across the linguistic border.¹

These indications of literary activity in Aquitania under William the Great, and his immediate descendants, are not very numerous, but they are concentrated. They group around Limoges most significantly, and they prove that artistic composition in both Latin and Provençal was cultivated in that town during the entire eleventh century, if not during the last half of the tenth. Limoges was undoubtedly a point of contact between the two literatures and a meeting-place. There we may pardonably conjecture a collaboration between the cloister and the market. The poet or dramatist of the abbey, inventing a new hymn or trope for his chapel, may have set his poems to a melody echoing from the city streets. And the popular rhymster, essaying a higher flight for his winged strophe, may have received friendly criticism from his better educated confessor. Such mutual assistance would explain the development of sequence forms and the liturgical drama, and on the other hand would show us how art entered into rustic poesy. The language of the Church poems had been perfected centuries before, the phrases of Provençal song were surely still rude, yet the spirit which breathed in the one, and which we can feel, aids us in reconstituting the forces which must have animated the other. Indeed we reach a reasonable conception of the social and mental environ-

¹ Chabaneau, *Revue des langues romanes* xxxv, pp. 379-394; *Romania* xxxi, pp. 177-200; *Romanische Forschungen* xxiii ("Mélanges Chabaneau"), pp. 197-204, 469-478, 597-620.

ment of France and Aquitania under William and Robert only through the study of the Latin writings of their time. This fact by itself justifies our contention. At the turning-point in the history of medieval culture the thought of one of the most highly civilized communities of Europe sought expression in learned and popular speech. Of the learned the records are fairly plentiful, of the popular hardly to be discovered. Without the former we cannot gain an understanding of the latter.¹

For if we take secular lyric poetry from the territory and the time of William the Great and Robert the Pious we are sure of but two specimens, and both of them in

¹ It is admitted that the first known Troubadours, William IX of Poitou and his friend, Ebles II of Ventadorn, had predecessors in artistic verse, from whom these nobles learned their trade. As William IX, who was born in 1071, must have begun to write by 1090, his master in the gay science would have composed his first songs by 1060, at least. Another generation of instructors would connect with the courtiers of William the Great, the grandfather of William IX. The author of the *Chanson de Ste. Foy*, who wrote about 1100, speaks of a poem which united both literary and popular characteristics, and which would date back into the eleventh century, before the poems of William IX:

Canczon audi q'es bella'n tresca

Que fo de razo espanesca. ll. 14, 15 (*Romania* XXXI, p. 180.)

My own impression is that both French and Provençal literature began under Robert the Pious, that is to say, composition in these languages first assumed literary form on the eve of the eleventh century. French epic poetry seems to have been inspired by feudalism. It proclaims feudal society as though it were newly constituted. It is also characterized by religious feeling and national pride, both of which emotions come to the front under the first Capetians. Provençal lyric poetry, while assuming certain popular notions, is essentially a product of court life, and court life in Aquitania began in the years of comparative peace which closed the tenth century.—The connection of sequence music and popular melody seems certain, though still obscure. See J. B. Beck, *Die Melodien der Troubadours* (Strassburg, 1908) I, pp. 65-69; cf. *Analecta Hymnica* XX, p. 24.

Latin. Fulbert's ode to the nightingale singing in the blossoming springtime, and written in the popular verse of the Romance peoples, trochaic tetrameter (Fulbert even uses the monorime strophe of three lines which seems to have been the first choice of William IX of Poitou), works over a popular theme which the good bishop endeavors in his final strophe to turn into a means of edification. More frank and true to its probable model, however, is the ending of a love song preserved by one of St. Martial's scribes. The song itself, "Jam dulcis amica, venito," where a lover bids his mistress to a feast he has spread for her, is also found in a Viennese manuscript of perhaps an earlier date. The two versions differ considerably. The St. Martial's is inferior to the other, and omits several of its strophes. But it atones for all shortcomings by a crowning strophe, of which its rival of Vienna is apparently ignorant. And this strophe, the final quatrain of the poem, sums up together those particular ideas, which in the vernacular of the people were to become the conventional prelude of Troubadour song:

Jam nix glaciesque liquescit,
Folium et herba virescit,
Philomela jam cantat in alto,
Ardet amor cordis in antro.

Spring, the nightingale and love. A familiar grouping which, strange as it may seem, this lyric alone of the poems handed down from the tenth and eleventh centuries sets to one melody. But its appearance here proves its existence elsewhere. Consonant with its environment, social or literary, this seemingly isolated verse is not isolated in fact. Rather we may look upon it as representative, representative of the new life and the new art which shaped it. For it brings us tidings of a nation's poetry, solitary and

alone as it yet may stand, a poetry which after the passing of two more generations will come forward in vigorous strength, to begin its famous career with the melodies of William the Great's grandson, William IX, count of Poitou.¹

¹The poem, "Jam dulcis amica, venito," is reproduced in facsimile by E. de Coussemaker, in his *Histoire de l'Harmonie au moyen âge*, pp. 107-109, and Planche VIII, No. 2 (St. Martial ms.), Planche IX, No. 1 (Vienna ms.), each with musical notation. The St. Martial manuscript dates from the reign of Hugh Capet (987-996), and is found at the Bibliothèque Nationale (Latin 1118). The poem in question was added to this manuscript some ten to thirty years later, according to my colleague, Dr. LeCompte, who has examined it. It is printed in the *Analecta Hymnica* XI, No. 91, and in Du Méril, *Poésies populaires latines du moyen âge*, pp. 196, 197.—Two other poems of a similar nature may belong to the same region and period. They are contained in the well-known Cambridge manuscript of verse, which can be dated at various times from 968 to 1039, where Fulbert's ode also appears. One of these poems praises spring and the birds, in Sapphic meter. The other, in octosyllabic quatrains (aabb), shows us a woman longing for her lover while spring is blooming and the birds are singing: See *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* XIV, pp. 491, 492 ("Carmen Aestivum") and pp. 492, 493 ("Verna Feminae Suspiria").—The relations of secular Latin lyric to popular song in the Middle Ages are excellently treated by Philip S. Allen in *Modern Philology* for April, 1906 ("The Origins of German Minnesang"), January, July, and October, 1908, and January, 1909 ("Mediæval Latin Lyrics"). Dr. Allen's conclusions are stated in the number for October, 1908, pp. 179, 180.—For the religious lyric of this period a stirring example is offered by the "De Die Novissimo," of a Montpellier ms., a forerunner of the "Dies Irae," if not its model. See *Analecta Hymnica* XLIX, No. 778; W. Meyer, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* I, pp. 237-239.

THE CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS

DELIVERED ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 28, IN CHICAGO, ILL.,
AT THE FOURTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
CENTRAL DIVISION OF THE ASSOCIATION.

BY OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR AND THE MODERN
LANGUAGES.¹

Tonight, the Modern Language Association of America rounds out a quarter century of active existence. Twenty-five years ago this holiday season its first meeting was called together in the city of New York. At that time forty instructors, representing twenty institutions of learning, gathered at Columbia College, as it then was, to consider their common interests in modern language instruction. It was a small beginning. No doubt there were some fears in the minds of the enterprising founders, as to the possible success of the undertaking. The few who had before taken an active share in associational interests had been a part of the American Philological Association, the main purpose of which was a study of the classical languages. There may well have been some doubts as to the practicability of an organization exclusively devoted to the modern tongues, at a time when they were so slightly regarded.

Yet a quarter century has amply justified the enterprise. Such a period, too, all but lost in the history of a nation, is

¹ The appearance in the *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten*, Beilage 63, of an article entitled *Die Wissenschaft in Amerika*, makes it proper for me to say that my subject was chosen and most of the address written before that article was published.

momentous in the life of an individual, or of such an organization as ours. It is the period of birth, of guiding uncertain steps, of early ripening through experience, of blossoming into full power and usefulness. Its history is particularly interesting and instructive. For this reason I trust it will not seem to you inappropriate that, at the close of this its first quarter century, we should look back on the course our organization has so far run, note its growth to maturity in time and purpose, congratulate ourselves on its achievements, and consider its present power and possibilities. Nor need we confine our backward look wholly to the Association itself. We may reasonably scan more widely the development of modern language instruction during this important period, and perhaps gain some inspiration for that future which tonight clasps hands with a not inglorious past.

The birth of the Modern Language Association was opportune. Early in the year 1883 it was conceived in the minds of a few fore-seeing teachers of modern languages. In those same months another American, eminent in public life, teacher also in the broader sense, was revolving a somewhat kindred conception, which was to add a new impulse to the study of the modern tongues. That eminent American, I need scarcely say, was Charles Francis Adams, and his thought developed into that still famous address, called *The College Fetich*. I need but recall it, to remind you of the wit, the brilliancy, the scathing yet honest arraignment of preparatory and college training, because they practically excluded the modern languages and the mother tongue, in favor of those which were no longer spoken, and no longer even read in the practical affairs of modern life. I need but recall to you the profound sensation caused by this indictment of classical usurpation. Nor need I add that, sensational as was the condemnation, it was made with a profound sense of its importance. It was an arraignment of classical

instruction in the house of its friends, but it was meant in a most friendly spirit. Its delivery was in public and on a notable occasion, only because private expostulation would have been worse than useless.

But it is not my purpose at present to consider this famous educational manifesto. I recall it to show that the time was ripe for the establishment of such an association as ours. Nor was this the only indication of similar opportuneness. The struggle between modern and classical culture was going on in Germany, and the educational institutions in which the modern languages had displaced Greek were gaining firmer and firmer foothold in the empire. In 1880, graduates of the Realschule were first permitted matriculation in the universities. A year before our Association was founded the Realschule of the better class were first given the title, Realgymnasien. While these were not great advances, they were some indication of better things to come. In England, also, the claims of modern language instruction were beginning to attract notice, if more slowly. To take one significant fact, two years after the Association was founded the movement had resulted in the establishment of a new professorship of English at Oxford and the appointment of Professor A. S. Napier, a man trained in the best modern methods. All these things emphasize that the time had come for a new step forward, a new organization to solidify the results so far obtained, to plan for further progress in the future.

The growth of the Association in the last quarter century has been its fullest justification. I mentioned that forty teachers gathered at the first meeting in New York, and this number may be assumed to represent the charter group. In ten years the membership of the body had increased more than ten-fold, or to 430 subscribers to our *Publications*. In the remaining fifteen years of existence, the list has con-

siderably more than doubled the record of the first decade. Nor is this all. For a little more than one decade, a single corporate body sufficed for the entire membership. Then, in the twelfth year of the parent Association, the vigorous young offshoot which you represent was firmly planted and began its sturdy growth. I need not remind you that your course was at first regarded with some fear. There were those who, jealous for all our best interests as I firmly believe, thought your desire for an Association nearer home might mean schism and possible discord. Traveling only up and down the Atlantic coast, they did not fully realize the magnificent distances of this Mesopotamia of our mighty land. Fortunately, all misunderstandings soon past away. You showed from the first that your aims were unselfish, your purposes in fullest sympathy with those of the parent body. From the first you have been a source of strength, never of weakness.

Yet the establishment and growth of the Modern Language Association is only one of many indications, that a new era in the study of the modern languages began some quarter of a century ago. What then have been the tangible results of this period of progress? I say tangible advisedly, for many of the subtler effects can never be adequately estimated. They belong to the inmost life of the subject. They are part of the fiber of teacher and pupil and have been wrought into the life tissue of our educational body. But results of the more tangible sort there are in abundance, and we may well review them, in order to strengthen our hands and invigorate our purposes.

In the first place, the period covered by the life of the Association is about commensurate with the more important development of graduate instruction in America. It is true that there were some graduate students in this country before the first meeting of this Association. But counting

all those who could in any way be regarded as in this class, the number in 1883 scarcely exceeded five hundred, or a little more than one for every college and university in the country.¹ It is also true that the Harvard graduate school was founded as early as 1870, but it was not until Johns Hopkins University was established in 1876 that graduate instruction in the fullest sense can be said to have taken a firm hold upon the country. Then, and then only, that farsighted educational leader who has this year past away gave to America the best results of university training abroad. Allowing some brief period for getting under way, the more significant work of Johns Hopkins University is almost a part of the period we review.

Before that time, owing to lack of opportunity in our own country, it was necessary for the student desiring broader training to spend some years in Europe, generally Germany. In 1880 there were 172 such Americans studying in that country. Foreign residence and study will always have its special value. America, too, will always recognize its debt to what is educationally the great Teutonic fatherland. Yet it was manifestly impossible that the majority of those desiring graduate training should be able to obtain it in a foreign land, and manifestly important that such instruction should be made freely accessible near at home. Just that has happened in the lifetime of this Association. After the founding of John Hopkins, graduate schools sprang up in all our best universities. The result has been an extraordinary growth in this branch of university culture. It is true

¹ See the *Report of the Commissioner of Education* for 1882-83. In his Commemorative Address published in *Science*, xv, 330 f. (1902), President Ira Remsen of Johns Hopkins University stated that in 1850 there were eight graduate students in the United States. Of these three were at Harvard, three at Yale, one at the University of Virginia, and one at Trinity College. In 1875 the number had increased to 399.

some American graduates still study abroad, but the number at present is probably not over 500, or about three times what it was a quarter century ago.¹ On the other hand, the number of graduate students in America has increased to nearly, if not quite, eight thousand, or fifteen times as many as when our Association came into existence.

It is needless to say that the development of graduate instruction has been of incalculable advantage to the whole teaching profession. It is equally needless to emphasize that in this advantage the modern languages have more than fairly shared. I know that the kind of instruction given in our graduate schools is sometimes criticised. Let us grant that it may be improved, but let us also be optimistic enough to believe that it will improve. The criticism that implies all is wrong is surely captious and caviling. Nor have I seen many practical hints of what should replace the excellent courses which now instruct and train in a methodical and helpful manner. It may be that the graduate schools do not attract the creative geniuses, but I can hardly believe they have deprived us of many such by permanently dampening their ardor, or blighting their budding powers. It is a grave question whether the seemingly serious criticism of present graduate courses does not primarily rest on the student's unwillingness to prepare himself broadly for the field of knowledge which should be made his own. If such be the case, the rising generation of graduate students may be warned that there is more danger of specializing in superficiality, than from intensive study.

¹ Based on the *Report of the Commissioner of Education* for 1906-7, the last available. It is there stated that there were, in that year, 309 American graduate students in Germany, tho it is suggested that the number may be too small. Of course only graduate students in university work are here included. Of other students pursuing various kinds of study abroad the number is much larger.

Seriously, there will always be room for all kinds of good teaching in graduate schools. There is no real conflict between good teaching in different fields of a broad subject. Nor should one kind of good teaching exclude the other.' The highest ideal of the teacher is well-rounded development. But the necessary corollary to such a proposition is, that well-rounded development always means some training on the weaker side. In our special fields of learning there is nothing more important for the literary critic than some fundamental conception of language, and of the growth and development of that greatest medium of artistic expression. It is equally true that the philologist in the narrower sense needs the inspiring and broadening acquaintance with the artistic side of literature.

Side by side with the growth of the graduate school, another evidence of great progress in modern language scholarship in America during the last twenty-five years is the development of the spirit of investigation. Such a spirit, it is true, possessed the whole nineteenth century. Witness the splendid results from the questioning of nature in all her various phases. Witness the abundant harvests from archeological research and the delving into historical sources of all sorts. Nor was the spirit unknown in our own fields of language and literature. It produced the epoch-making *Deutsche Grammatik* of Grimm as early as 1819, and the equally important *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* of Diez in 1836 to 1842. In our own country, Professor F. J. Child of Harvard had printed his first edition of the *Ballads* in the late fifties, and his important study of the language of Chaucer in 1862. In 1870, also, Professor Francis A. March had issued his *Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language*. Nor must we omit the stimulus to research given by the American Philological Association, founded in 1868.

Notwithstanding these facts, however, a new and much wider impulse toward investigation came with the establishment of graduate instruction in America, the influence of German training, and the founding of our Association as a medium for the interchange of ideas. Before that time it had usually been enough for a teacher to present the facts embodied in a text-book of the subject. He usually made little attempt to keep up with the latest results of research. Many of these results he did not appreciate, or know how to apply. Not an investigator himself, he could scarcely correlate the new knowledge with that which he had come to regard as fixed and unchangeable. All this was radically altered by the new investigatory spirit. Those training in the graduate school there learned what research really meant, and how it could be applied in their several fields. The teacher became an investigator as well, and thus added to his function of imparting knowledge that of extending the boundaries of what is known.

The spirit of investigation, it may be pointed out, has exhibited itself in two somewhat different fields. In the one, it shows closest kinship with the spirit of the modern scientist. The latter broadens the field of knowledge by asking, not what has been, but what is. He gets little direct assistance from previous or speculative conceptions. He puts his questions directly to Nature and compels her to speak. Such investigation of what is, has been opened anew to the modern language scholar in the last quarter century. You will remember the *Junggrammatiker* asserted, that we are not ready for questions of the origin of language until we know more of the essential characteristics of speech itself. So began the science of phonetics, with its body of more precise knowledge of speech sounds. So came a truer philosophy of language, and of its growth and development. Nor are all such problems yet solved. The physiology of

speech sounds, it is true, has been about exhausted. But the physicist tells us that sound has received less attention than any other of the greater phenomena of nature. There is still room for the physical investigation of speech sounds, and such investigation awaits the trained linguist who is also fully equipped on the side of physics.

Again the broad field of present usage in language is open to further scientific research. To instance one portion of this broad field, the practical teaching of English expression has made vast strides in our time. On the other hand, rhetorical theory has scarcely advanced beyond its presentation in the eighteenth century. It is still a catalog of 'thou shalt not's'; a decalog multiplied by hundreds. Why may it not become a series of positive doctrines, based upon closer and keener observation of the art of expression? I cite such specific examples only to show that the end of this sort of research has by no means come. We might all add many other fields which the individual student, no matter how situated, may cultivate in a profitable manner.

The spirit of investigation has also exhibited itself in what we may call the development of the historic sense. This sense asks not what is, but how and from what something has come to be. It delves into analogues, parallels, sources, originals, in order to explain the growth and development of some great work. It asks what were the influences under which a masterpiece was composed, what previous works had bearing upon it, what materials were used by the new writer. The result of such studies has been a flood of light upon problems of literary development, and especially a new conception of originality. We now appreciate, as never before, the dependence of one man of genius upon another, of one age upon the many ages that had preceded.

No one estimates more highly than I the value of such

study of sources and origins. No one of us would stay such investigations. Upon them we are all dependent, and for them correspondingly grateful. But it is still right to point out the extremes to be avoided even when one is guided by the historic sense. Let every fact be gathered with the most diligent care, and every parallel be searched with the most minute exactness. But let it also be remembered that the crucial test of the investigation is in the management of material and in the inferences drawn. Inductive reasoning is based upon the gathering of examples, something of which may be done by the ordinary mind. The power of making correct inferences springs from a mental grasp amounting almost to genius. The great number of new facts regarding Chaucer's life and works discovered in the last few years are of the greatest value. Some considerable number of the inferences from these facts can not possibly be true. They are at variance with each other, positively contradictory, or at most only as plausible as some other conclusions. In general, little time should be wasted on an inference that is at best only plausible.

Another phase of the study of origins may also be carried too far. Ever since Wolf propounded his theory of the Homeric poems, it has been a favorite pastime of the separatist to assume the composite character of some famous work, and assign its parts with great apparent exactness to the somewhat indefinite A, B, or C. No one would deny that Wolf's theory has been of material advantage to modern scholarship. That such a theory may be true of some works is amply illustrated by the growth, in historic times, of the Arthur legend. Malory's *Morte D'Arthur*, for example, or Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* based upon it, is a union of the originally separate Arthur, Merlin, Launcelot, Tristan, and Holy Grail stories. But the separatist is not always so fortunate in his problem, or may think he sees a

problem were none exists. It is almost pathetic to consider the time and patience spent on mistaken conceptions of our early epic *Beowulf*. One is reminded of the great classical scholar Bentley, who set up his theory of an imperfect Milton text, and then amended the assumed scribal errors as in the case of an imperfect classical manuscript. It is to be hoped that the saneness of American scholarship will not often be led so far astray.¹

All such problems of origins rest on the far greater one of personality. So long as we have not read that riddle more profoundly, it will be impossible to determine from merely internal evidence what may or may not have been written by a single person, at different times, or in different moods. It may be suggested therefore, that while many more definite subjects need the acumen of the scholar, the investigator may well avoid the subtler depths that may never be satisfactorily fathomed.

Still, in spite of such criticism, which is meant to be suggestive of the future rather than proscriptive of the past, there are ample evidences that the American scholar, during the last quarter century, has learned to investigate as well as instruct. The number of significant studies of this sort has greatly increased, and in general their methods have been sound and their conclusions sane. Many important results of these labors are quite as necessary to us all, as the labors and researches of our foreign colleagues.

A third significant sign of progress in modern language study in America is the increase in publications dealing with the subject. When the Modern Language Association was founded, no publication in any English speaking country

¹ It is right to say that these strictures have in no sense been suggested by the new question of the authorship of *Piers Plowman*. On that question it is too early to form an opinion. Yet the attitude of skepticism toward the separatist doctrine, seems to me the soundest until the proof is unmistakable.

was exclusively devoted to the study of the modern tongues. Before that time studies in these subjects sought publication in various places. When Professor Child prepared his study of the language of Chaucer in 1862 he found a place for it in the *Proceedings of the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences*. After 1868 American scholars might print in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, and after 1880, three years before our Association was founded, in the *American Journal of Philology*. British scholars had, in their own country, but one opportunity for more than short papers, that of the *Proceedings of the Philological Society*, founded in 1842. Germany, of course, was better provided with scholarly journals. The *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen* had been established in 1846, and *Germania* ten years later. The decade, or a little more, before our Association came into existence had been prolific of German periodicals. The *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie* dates from 1869, Paul and Braune's *Beiträge* from 1875. Then came the *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* and *Englische Studien* in 1877, *Anglia* in 1878, and the *Zeitschrift für Neufranzösische Sprache* in 1879. In 1870, also, the French added to their older periodicals the *Revue des Langues Romanes*, and in 1872 *Romania*.

Yet none of these furnished a natural medium for American scholarship. In all the years preceding the founding of this Association there were, in these foreign periodicals, scarcely a half-dozen articles by Americans.¹ All these were

¹ These modern language pioneers in publishing abroad may be worth noting especially. In the first volume of *Englische Studien* Professor F. A. March had an article, *Is there an Anglo-Saxon Language?* The remaining articles are all in *Anglia* and include, *Philip Massinger* by James Phelan, vol. I, i; *Chaucer's influence upon James I of Scotland* by Henry Wood, II, 223; *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem* by W. M. Baskervill, IV, 139; *The Sources of Tindale's New Testament* by J. L. Cheney, VI, 277. The dissertation of George E. MacLean, *Ælfric's Version of Alcuin's Interrogationes Sigewulfi in Genesin*, was also begun in this same volume.

in the newly established *Anglia* and *Englische Studien*, and most of them were the dissertations of young Americans who had been studying in Germany. Even the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* were not largely utilized by modern language scholars. That publication contained but twenty-five such articles in the sixteen years to the close of 1883. The *American Journal of Philology*, founded after graduate instruction was fully established, attracted a somewhat larger number of contributors. Some eighteen articles on modern language subjects appeared in that periodical, during the four years before the founding of our Society.¹

Such was the state of affairs when the *Publications* of this Association first offered their opportunity to modern language scholars. That the opportunity has been fully appreciated the twenty-three stately volumes fully testify. As they stand on the library shelves, beside publications of other kinds or other countries, they make their own mute but effective appeal. It would not be possible to deny that occasionally a less important, even a somewhat unimportant, article has been printed. But it will be equally admitted that the succeeding volumes contain some of the most scholarly work published in America. There have been, besides, increasing originality, increasing grasp of detail, increasing power in dealing with serious problems.

In one respect the *Publications* of the Association show a striking change as the years have gone by. The early numbers contain a much larger proportion of articles on methods of teaching. The importance of such articles I by no means underestimate. Indeed, I have long thought that the college instructor lags behind in methods of presentation. Yet the exclusive devotion of such an Association as

¹ I include here articles rather than notes. On the other hand many of the articles are short and would often be considered as notes, rather than considerable studies.

this to questions of pedagogy would be manifestly improper. It is reason for congratulation, therefore, that the later volumes of the *Publications* have been given over more largely to advancing our knowledge in hitherto unexplored fields.

Moreover our *Publications* were only the beginning of opportunity for the appearance of scholarly work in this country. Two years after the Association's first meeting, *Modern Language Notes* was founded, the first number appearing in 1886. Its appearance month by month during the academic year, and its reception of both short and long articles, have admirably fitted it to be our most convenient means of communication with each other. Three years more and, in its narrower field, the Dialect Society began the issue of *Dialect Notes*. If apology seems necessary for including a publication of such meager output, I may remind you of its meager annual subscription, and the small number of workers in what is really a deserving field. The purpose of its founders was broad enough, for it was intended to include all phases of dialectal study. While dealing mainly with English, as was natural, the *Notes* have included occasional articles on French and Spanish, as well as exceptionally good ones on the Scandinavian languages in America.

A further advance in periodical publications was next made by our greatly lamented friend, the chairman whom I have the honor to succeed, when he established the *Journal of Germanic Philology* in 1897. Nor is it too much to say that, considering the high ideals of the founder and the personal sacrifices he so bravely made, the *Journal of Germanic Philology* set the high-water mark in this country for individual endeavor in modern language scholarship. Six years later, in 1903, the last of our great periodicals began in the splendid numbers of *Modern Philology*. Including the *Publications* of the Association, virtually a quarterly for

many years, the last quarter century has seen the establishment of four periodicals of first class importance, now, if not always, equal to the best publications abroad. Besides, the numbers of such periodicals might be still increased, if we included those devoted to a single field of modern language instruction.¹

Nor are these more regular issues America's only contributions of general periodical nature. The quarter century has been especially prolific of semi-periodical publications by different educational institutions. Time would fail me if I attempted to include all these, and I may now remind you only of some of the more important. The Association had been founded only four years when in 1887 and 1888 Professors Stoddard and Cook used the *Library Studies* of the University of California for excellent monographs on English subjects. In the latter year *University Studies* were also issued by the University of Nebraska, while in 1891 began the important *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania*. The next year, 1892, the extremely valuable *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* were first issued at Harvard. In 1898 came the *Yale Studies in English*, now reaching to some thirty-odd numbers, and the Wisconsin *University Studies in Philology and Literature*. Similar *Studies* have also been issued at other institutions in this great central west, as those of the University of Illinois in 1900, the University of Missouri in 1901, the University of Iowa in 1907. As I said at the beginning I make no pretence at a complete list of these Studies, and your memories will doubtless supply a number of others, some of which are quite as valuable as those I have mentioned. All

¹ I may note especially the *German American Annals*, earlier the *Americana Germanica* of Professor Learned, and the more recently established *Monatshefte*, earlier *Pädagogische Monatshefte*, one part of which is edited by Professor Roedder of the University of Wisconsin.

are important as evidence of a new spirit of scholarly production, and many of them are indispensable.¹

In connection with these publications, another class of writings shows noteworthy progress during the last twenty-five years. Text-books do not always represent the highest kind of scholarly production. But however lightly we may regard them, each quarter century and each generation must have its new series of such books, or the schools stand still. Either new material needs presentation, or new methods of presentation deserve recognition. A quarter century ago, in most of the modern languages, the text-books were largely of foreign origin, or directly based upon those prepared abroad. During the period we survey this has been almost completely reversed. Modern language text-books have been more and more largely prepared in this country, while the best of ours are not unknown in actual use abroad. We may reasonably assume that, while monographs of special excellence will always be sought out, no matter where produced, American schools will never again be dependent upon foreigners for well-edited texts and proper introductory books of all sorts.

¹ In Mr. J. D. Thompson's *Handbook of Learned Societies and Institutions* (*Publications of the Carnegie Institution*, 1908) the following are given in addition to those mentioned above: *Radcliffe College Monographs*, (first in modern languages), 1891; *Kansas University Quarterly*, 1893; *Western Reserve University Bulletin*, 1895; *University of Virginia Monographs, School of Teutonic Languages*, later *University of Virginia Studies in the Teutonic Languages*, 1899; *Columbia University Studies in English*, *Columbia University Studies in Literature*, and the *University of Cincinnati Bulletin*, 1900; *Yale Bicentennial Publications*, *Columbia University Germanic Studies*, 1901; *Columbia University Studies in Comparative Literature*, and *Studies in Romance Philology and Literature*, 1902; *University of Chicago Decennial Publications*, *Colorado College Studies in Language and Literature*, and *University of Texas Humanistic Series*, 1904; *University of Cincinnati Studies*, (superseding the *Bulletin* above), 1905; *University of North Carolina Studies in Philology*, 1906; *University of Pennsylvania Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures*, 1907.

In only one respect, perhaps, does this subject of text-books suggest a note of warning. While it is highly important that the schools should have books prepared by the best minds, there is danger that the alluring rewards for popular text-books may dampen our ardor for the higher learning, and even weaken our perception of what ought to be included in them. It is surely not too much to say, that the American scholar of high purposes may well beware of attempting any book to which he is not called with some higher aim than mere commercial success.

Again, the quarter century just past has seen a marvelous advance in the building of scholarly libraries, and the material increase in resources of those already in existence. The period has been one of library building in every respect, but I do not now consider the great number of public libraries established. Excellent as they are, they are of comparatively little assistance to the modern scholar. I therefore refer to a parallel development of far greater importance to us. When the Association was founded, there were few great collections on the modern languages, even in the university libraries.¹ Harvard had one such, a collection of folk-lore and medieval romances gathered under the direction of Professor Child, and supposed to be the largest in existence. Perhaps we should add the George P. Marsh library at the University of Vermont, one strong in Italian and the Scandinavian languages. No other great collections are recorded as antedating 1883. The next year, however, Professor Charles Eliot Norton gave his Dante collection to Harvard College, and Senator Anthony of Rhode Island bequeathed to Brown University the Harris collection of American poetry. These were all libraries gathered by

¹ The facts here given are on the basis of Lane and Bolton's *Notes on Special Collections in American Libraries*, 1892, in *Bibliographical Contributions of Harvard University Library*, edited by Justin Winsor, No. 45.

Americans. A new step was taken when the splendid library of Wilhelm Scherer was purchased by Western Reserve University in 1887. In 1893 the Zarncke library was similarly acquired by Cornell University, and during the same year that institution began receiving the first instalments of the magnificent Dante collection, which has since been completed. About the same time the libraries of Leland Stanford and Chicago Universities were gathered with astonishing rapidity, the latter institution buying sixty thousand volumes from a single source.

Nor are such collections,—and I have by no means mentioned all,—the only evidence, or perhaps the best evidence, of the great increase of libraries for the scholar. A quarter century ago college libraries, especially of the middle west, were largely haphazard collections, made up of gifts from men who had purchased with little method, and seldom with a knowledge of the best books. Indeed the books of fundamental importance were often lamentably lacking. This was especially true of modern language collections. In the last quarter century, however, the buying of books has been put on a methodical basis, by men who have known exactly what was best in their particular fields, who have been far-sighted in filling the important gaps in their subject matter, who have been willing to work unweariedly for years with a definite purpose toward a definite end. Such men have been emphasizing from the beginning the difference between books of fundamental value, books which never grow old because they are always new and necessary to each generation, and books of superficial and temporary importance. In this way the college and university libraries over the whole country have been vastly strengthened in the best things. While there would be little boasting of special collections, as these are necessarily limited, the number of libraries adequately equipped for scholarly study has been vastly

increased in all parts of our country. There is little reason now, why any man of high purpose may not carry on some valuable investigation in almost any place in which his work may fall.

With a continuation of such progress it will soon be true that few libraries abroad will rival the collections to be found somewhere in our own land. Nor are such collections inaccessible because not found in one or two places. Another excellent feature of library development has been the progress in library comity. It is almost as easy to draw upon the large collections, and even the extremely valuable books in any part of our country, as to obtain the treasures of many a foreign library after you have ended your thousands of miles of travel and stand before the librarian's desk. In only one important particular do the foreign libraries still inevitably excel, that is in their priceless manuscripts. Yet even in this we see our way to gaining easy access to their wealth, without plundering them of their coveted treasures. The sunlight shows no diminution of brightness, because in these later centuries it floods a new world as well as the old. And so, pressing the sunlight into our service, we propose to bring from the old world the inexpensive but equally good photographic copies of manuscripts that could never be ours by purchase. This Association, and the Central Division especially, is to be congratulated on the movement for manuscript reproduction begun last year. Nor is it too much to hope that you and I will live to see, perhaps by some still cheaper method, the friendly rifling of all those manuscript possessions which are the unique pride of the old world.

A last and greatest evidence of progress in the modern languages is the altered position which they now hold in institutions of all ranks, as compared with their position twenty-five years ago. To emphasize that altered position,

let us return for a moment to the address of Charles Francis Adams. That address excited great controversy. That the long entrenched classical instruction should be called by such an opprobrious name as the college fetich, aroused the supporters of the classics, especially Greek, almost to fury. We can now see that, as in many literary quarrels, the controversialists mist the main point. As most of us today, Mr. Adams was quite willing to admit the value of classical studies for certain people. He was willing to grant that some Latin was worth while for all liberally educated men. But in addition, he made this modest plea for the modern tongues:

“So far from demanding that Greek and Latin be driven out, and French and German substituted for them, we do not even ask that the modern languages be put on an even footing with the classics . . . We are willing,—at least I am willing,—to concede a preference, and a great preference, to the dead over the living, to the classic over the modern. All I would ask would be, that the preference afforded to the one should no longer, as now, amount to practical prohibition of the other.”¹

With this modest proposal of 1883, so modest that we can hardly understand its exciting so considerable a storm of controversy, compare the actual status of the modern languages in all grades of instruction today. What more striking evidence of the revolution that has taken place in a quarter of a century! French and German have been placed on a footing of absolute equality with Greek in the college entrance requirements, while many institutions give them equality with Latin in whole or in part. The mother tongue, which was formerly relegated to an obscure corner

¹ Reprinted in *Three Phi Beta Kappa Addresses*, (1907) pp. 39–40.

of the entrance examinations, now counts for its full quota of required units. In college and university training, all modern languages rank with the classics in degree-advancing power.

Indeed, the change is much more sweeping than these statements imply. From a position of required subjects for the whole body of students, thru at least ²/₃ two years of the college curriculum, the classics are largely or wholly elective, and attract few more students than those who wish special study in them for some specific purpose. In fact the number of students is so small that the time may not be far distant when, in the smaller institutions at ²/₃ least, both subjects will be taught by a single instructor, as twenty-five years ago French and German were often taught by one individual. Besides, from being a required subject for entrance to college, Greek is becoming a beginner's subject in college. Nor is it impossible that, in the next few years, the same may come to be true of Latin. When not offered for entrance, opportunity may perhaps be given by which it may be begun and carried on during the collegiate years. Such a condition, by no means to be deplored, might be of real service in reclaiming some portion of the lost ground for this more important of the two classical languages.

This revolution in the position of the classics is perhaps not to be regarded on our part with unmingled feelings of exultation. It may be that the pendulum has swung too far. I am still old-fashioned enough to believe profoundly in the training of the classical laboratory, where the apparatus is a text and a dictionary, and the experiments are made by the teacher on the pupil. That is a far more effective kind of experimentation, I am sure, than the lecture system, unaccompanied by the most exacting tests of the individual. I still believe in the value of a reading knowledge of Latin, tho I care less today whether the text be that of Vergil or

Claudian, Cicero or Boëthius or a medieval monk. Probably we are all much more in sympathy with the proper study of the classics than the exponents of those subjects seem to think. Yet however we may agree or differ on this point, we are agreed in our profound appreciation of the new position to which the modern languages have attained, a position from which they will probably never be displaced. The American scholar in these subjects has come into his own.

But it is not enough to remind you of the growth of the Association; the fuller development of graduate instruction in America; the results of the new impulse toward investigation; the multiplication of important publications; the building of scholarly libraries; the greatly enhanced position of the modern languages. For all such evidences of progress we are, and should be, profoundly grateful. Yet it is still the part of wisdom to remember that opportunity means responsibility. It may still be wise to inquire whether these evidences of progress present the whole story of educational advancement in the modern tongues. Progress is sometimes so rapid as to weaken vital forces. Has it been so in any sense with modern language development in America? Have other influences militated against the fullest advancement in our fields?

In considering such questions let me say at once that I assume no right to do more than suggest the grave, side by side with the more hopeful, view. I rest solely in the right of any one of us to examine himself or his calling, and take critical account of all present conditions. If such examination is not wholly agreeable in an individual case, let me assure you that it is not for its pleasure that I have undertaken it in this public way. Still, all will agree that it is better for us to examine ourselves than to be first portrayed by the hostile critic.

The extraordinary revolution, by which the modern languages have come to equality with the classics, may well suggest the question whether at present they fully deserve that position. Logically they must be said to have that desert, on the theory so common today, that every subject is the equal of every other. Yet, I take it, all of us have some lurking suspicion of such logic. It reminds us too much, perhaps, of the logic of the "one-hoss shay." We have all of us doubtless felt, at times, that the modern languages do not, in all respects, take the place of the classics they have so largely displaced. There is a certain fineness of quality about the best classical training not always reached by our modern language teaching. This may not be wholly our fault. The conditions may not be the same as those under which successful classical instruction has been carried on.

For one thing it must be admitted, I think, that we do not receive the same class of students as those who have usually given their attention to Latin and Greek. They do not, as a whole, represent the same seriousness of purpose, or the same mental fiber. This is due to many causes. The classical tongues, entrenched for centuries in scholastic curricula, had attracted a clientele which was recruited generation after generation from the same or similar sources. Those who choose Latin and Greek in college have been brought up to appreciate their importance, and have already entered upon their serious study in the lower schools. But even today, the modern languages can scarcely be said to have a large following of those who study them because of their necessity to the highest culture. Nor does the great literature of the mother tongue attract a large number who regard it as vital to the education of a cultured man or woman. Too large a number think some slight knowledge of the modern languages may be useful, tho in no sense essential.

Besides, students do not usually study the modern languages of Europe for that serious practical value which a speaking knowledge of them can have. It is true, courses in Spanish have been somewhat increased by the acquisition of our new dependencies. Yet even this has not materially altered our pride in knowing but one language, and that,—if the truth must be spoken for our college bred men,—none too thoroly. Our travelers, even our educated ones, give but a halting account of themselves on foreign soil. If they do not depend on a courier, after the older fashion described in Ruskin's *Præterita*, they can scarcely glory in their command of foreign tongues. Moreover, it is an oft repeated complaint, how largely our public service abroad suffers from a lack of intimate knowledge of foreign languages.

Again, too, our classes are overstocked, to say the least, with those who choose our work as the lesser of two evils. Some language and literature must be read they say, I can not think, reason. They will have none of the hated classics. A little German or French, a little English must be taken, and they will not perhaps too much interfere with the more serious business of athletics, the rushes and the rushing, the many social pleasures, and a good time generally.

I mention these things in no deeply pessimistic spirit. There is much ground for hope. We are not the only ones to suffer from lack of seriousness in the student body. It is characteristic of the times. But there are unmistakable signs of reaction. We may all live to see the day when the professional coach is not the best paid man on the faculty, the only man *of faculty* in the estimation of a large number of college men; when good healthy exercise of something besides the lungs will be a pleasure to all students; when there will be less appropriateness to a student contest in that passage of the psalmist which reads,

,Thou hast smitten all mine enemies upon the cheek bone,
Thou hast broken out the teeth of the ungodly :

when college sport and the college "sport" shall give way to gentlemanly, if still strenuous, recreation ; and when the college man shall again return to feast with delight upon "the dainties that are bred in a book."

A more serious change in our student following has resulted from other factors. The college and university are no longer in the main the training schools for the learned professions. The church no longer attracts a significant percentage of college men. Teaching, while presenting to the scholar far greater opportunities than formerly, can not begin to compete with the more lucrative callings. The law no longer holds out as its highest reward a place on the bench, but rather the position of guide and adviser to a business corporation. Neither law nor medicine, tho gaining immensely on the side of professional training, have yet been able to insist on the broader general foundation before professional training begins. Service of the state, except in the most limited fields, has never been entered thru the door of collegiate preparation. Finally, technical training, excellent as it is in its proper place, has so encroached upon our colleges and universities as seriously to militate against culture, even in the college community. The combined results of these factors is that the proportion of students loving learning for its own sake, earnestly seeking mental power, is almost swamped by the number of those whose ultimate aim is trade in some of its many enticing forms.

Yet, as teachers of the modern languages, we are not absolved from our duty by conditions that seem not wholly in our favor. We must still seek to exalt our subjects to equality with the old classical curriculum ; to train up a clientele that chooses the modern tongues with a new seriousness, and applies to them the best powers of the young mind ; to present with such persuasiveness the noble literatures of the greater modern nations, that they shall come to seem a necessary part of high culture.

Next to lack of seriousness and homogeneity in our student following must be placed, it seems to me, the less exacting, less studiously thoro, less critical teaching of the modern tongues. To this criticism it is some answer that the difference is in the modern languages themselves. Doubtless if we knew the classical languages in their spoken forms, we should find them as lacking in fixity and precision as their modern relatives. But we do not know them so, or we teach them to beginners at least, only in the more definite forms of great monuments, and those of a particular age. Besides, the classical tongues are so far removed from us that the pupil gets little help from a knowledge of his own language. They can be learned, therefore, only by an exacting amount of time and energy. But in the teaching of the modern tongues, if the problem is greater, the effort must be correspondingly greater to produce an equal effect. This, it seems to me, we should apprehend more fully than we have sometimes done, and make renewed efforts toward more methodical and exacting teaching.

One other factor in modern language teaching should be mentioned, tho it probably applies more fully to English in our colleges and universities than to any other tongue. I have already emphasized my belief in that special training of teachers which has so advanced during the last twenty-five years. Yet it is a serious question whether the results of that specialization have not been carried too far into the undergraduate curriculum. The unusual breadth of the English field has led to a corresponding specialization on the part of teachers. Such specialization has naturally suggested courses in special subjects, and these have greatly increased in recent years. The result has been, especially in our larger institutions, a breaking up of the subject into a great number of subdivisions. So many are there sometimes, that a student might take one or even two such subjects

thru several terms of his course, and yet get no connected idea of the literature of his mother tongue.

If we examine the reasons for this state of affairs, I believe we must see in them a sacrifice of the student's good to the pleasure of the instructor. The latter, in his fondness for specialization, offers the course in which he has specialized, or in which he wishes to carry on special study. He has no intention of sacrificing his students, and he reasons that a little intensive study will be of special value. All this would be true if his class were already thoroly grounded in essentials of literary study, knew the greater periods fairly well, and already appreciated the greater masterpieces. But such could scarcely be the case except with the most advanced undergraduates, or with students of the graduate school.

A third point merits brief consideration, even if we shall not wholly agree as to its status. I approach the criticism with the greater diffidence because it might seem directed against the personnel of our modern language profession. In reality it applies no more to us than to those engaged in many other lines of instruction. The vast improvement resulting from the special training of the modern graduate school can not be too highly appreciated. It is a hopeful sign when it may be said, with any degree of truth, that it is easier to obtain a graduate degree in some foreign universities than in the best of our own graduate schools. Yet it is not enough to rest in this flattering tribute. It is important that the American graduate degree should represent in all respects the highest type reasonably possible. It is most important that the American teacher, whether trained in the graduate school or not, should embody the highest type of scholarly attainment.

Still, with all the improvement in our professional training of the teacher, it is a question whether breadth of culture

has not been frequently sacrificed. The intense specialization of the last quarter century should relieve us of no proper obligations toward other fields than our own. Certainly specialization should never breed contempt for all except a single province of learning. Such contempt for other departments than one's own we are wont to associate, rightly or wrongly, with a certain narrowness of German culture. But whether a phase of German or American specialization, it is unworthy. Admirable as is that narrower intensity which 'steers right onward' thru calm and stormy depths of a single subject, there is no inherent reason why it may not be accompanied by catholicity of taste, breadth of sympathy with other fields, quickness and keenness of observation upon men and nature, and readiness to know something, if it can not be all, of many things.

The criticisms I have suggested in no unfriendly spirit are but to strengthen our purpose to meet a great opportunity. The altered positions of the modern languages and the classics mean, that the burden of culture rests upon us as it has never done before. A new battle of the books has been fought in our time, and the moderns more than share honors with the ancients in our systems of education. The responsibility is great, the opportunity that of a new era. Both call aloud for the highest conceptions of our calling, the highest ideals in our scholastic lives. It is for this reason that I have suggested, not so much in criticism of the past, as for their bearing on the future, these three things. We need a student following which in quality shall fully rank with the serious, high-minded youth who have demanded classical training in the past. We need a thoroughness in critical method which shall forever answer the complaint, that the modern languages do not furnish the same mental training as the classics. We need broad, as

well as specialized culture, that the American teacher of the modern tongues may have the same power and influence in college and community, as has hitherto belonged to his classical colleagues.

But I would not have the semblance of criticism as our last word together. Let me again recur to the hopeful side, as indicated by the extraordinary progress of the last quarter century. Let me again emphasize the splendid results so far accomplished, the splendid position we have thus far gained. Already the fruits of American scholarship are received with flattering attention abroad. On all accounts, we may say 'Our anniversary is one of hope.' How fully this should be apprehended may be clearer, if we recall that we have just past the anniversary of another notable event in the annals of American learning. Scarcely more than seventy years ago, the Concord philosopher emerged from the seclusion of plain living and high thinking which he had deliberately chosen, to enhearten and exalt the American scholar. In that famous address, before our oldest university, he proclaimed a new gospel. 'Our day of dependence,' he said, 'our long apprenticeship to the learning of other lands, draws to a close.' That address, that sentiment, has been aptly called the American declaration of intellectual independence. In a sense which the speaker intended only by implication, we may fittingly apply his words to our narrower, tho much loved fields. In a sense which he could have little appreciated in 1837, the modern language scholar of America has past his apprenticeship, has endured his *Wanderjahre*, and may now, without arrogance, claim some degree of mastership in his chosen domain. In a sense, new and far-reaching, the last quarter century has placed the future in our hands. With the modesty of the true learner, with the profound humility and

self-effacement of the truly wise, we may reach out to a fuller grasp of the opportunity so gloriously opening before us. What may not another such period bring to American scholarship? Surely I voice only too feebly your wish, that the American institution of learning may minister even more adequately to the intellectual life of the nation, and that in such ministration the American scholar in the modern languages may bear no unworthy part.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1909

President,

M. D. LEARNED,

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Vice-Presidents,

GUSTAV GRUENER,

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

E. W. OLMSTED,

Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

W. A. NEILSON,

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Secretary,

C. H. GRANDGENT,

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Treasurer,

WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD,

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CENTRAL DIVISION

Chairman,

A. G. CANFIELD,

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Secretary,

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON,

State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

ALCÉE FORTIER,

Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.

CHARLES HARRIS,

Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

GEORGE HEMPL,

Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.

JOHN M. MANLY,

University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

LEWIS F. MOTT,

College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH,

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

HENRY A. TODD,

Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

C. H. GRANDGENT,

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON,

State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

CALVIN THOMAS,

Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

JAMES W. BRIGHT,

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

CONSTITUTION OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

ADOPTED ON THE TWENTY-NINTH OF DECEMBER, 1903.

I.

The name of this Society shall be *The Modern Language Association of America*.

II.

1. The object of this Association shall be the advancement of the study of the Modern Languages and their Literatures thru the promotion of friendly relations among scholars, thru the publication of the results of investigation by members, and thru the presentation and discussion of papers at an annual meeting.

2. The meeting of the Association shall be held at such place and time as the Executive Council shall from year to year determine. But at least as often as once in four years there shall be held a Union Meeting, for which some central point in the interior of the country shall be chosen.

III.

Any person whose candidacy has been approved by the Secretary and Treasurer may become a member on the payment of three dollars, and may continue a member by the payment of the same amount each year. Any member, or any person eligible to membership, may become a life

member by a single payment of forty dollars or by the payment of fifteen dollars a year for three successive years. Distinguished foreign scholars may be elected to honorary membership by the Association on nomination by the Executive Council.

IV.

1. The officers and governing boards of the Association shall be: a President, three Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer; an Executive Council consisting of these six officers, the Chairmen of the several Divisions, and seven other members; and an Editorial Committee consisting of the Secretary of the Association (who shall be Chairman *ex officio*), the Secretaries of the several Divisions, and two other members.

2. The President and the Vice-Presidents shall be elected by the Association, to hold office for one year.

3. The Chairmen and Secretaries of Divisions shall be chosen by the respective Divisions.

4. The other officers shall be elected by the Association at a Union Meeting, to hold office until the next Union Meeting. Vacancies occurring between two Union Meetings shall be filled by the Executive Council.

V.

1. The President, Vice-Presidents, Secretary, and Treasurer shall perform the usual duties of such officers. The Secretary shall, furthermore, have charge of the Publications of the Association and the preparation of the program of the annual meeting.

2. The Executive Council shall perform the duties assigned to it in Articles II, III, IV, VII, and VIII; it shall, moreover, determine such questions of policy as may

be referred to it by the Association and such as may arise in the course of the year and call for immediate decision.

3. The Editorial Committee shall render such assistance as the Secretary may need in editing the Publications of the Association and preparing the annual program.

VI.

1. The Association may, to further investigation in any special branch of Modern Language study, create a Section devoted to that end.

2. The officers of a Section shall be a Chairman and a Secretary, elected annually by the Association. They shall form a standing committee of the Association, and may add to their number any other members interested in the same subject.

VII.

1. When, for geographical reasons, the members from any group of States shall find it expedient to hold a separate annual meeting, the Executive Council may arrange with these members to form a Division, with power to call a meeting at such place and time as the members of the Division shall select; but no Division meeting shall be held during the year in which the Association holds a Union Meeting. The expense of Division meetings shall be borne by the Association. The total number of Divisions shall not at any time exceed three. The present Division is hereby continued.

2. The members of a Division shall pay their dues to the Treasurer of the Association, and shall enjoy the same rights and privileges and be subject to the same conditions as other members of the Association.

3. The officers of a Division shall be a Chairman and a Secretary. The Division shall, moreover, have power to create such committees as may be needed for its own business. The program of the Division meeting shall be prepared by the Secretary of the Division in consultation with the Secretary of the Association.

VIII.

This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any Union Meeting, provided the proposed amendment has received the approval of two-thirds of the members of the Executive Council.

MEMBERS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

INCLUDING MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL DIVISION OF THE
ASSOCIATION.

- Adams, Arthur, Associate Professor of English, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
- Adams, Edward Larrabee, Instructor in Romance Languages, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [644 S. Ingalls St.]
- Adams, Warren Austin, Professor of German, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Alden, Raymond, Macdonald, Associate Professor of English, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal. [Box 82.]
- Alder, Eugene Charles, Superintendent, Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Alexander, Luther Herbert, Instructor in French, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Allard, Louis, Instructor in French, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [9 Hampden Hall, Plympton St.]
- Allen, Clifford Gilmore, Assistant Professor of Romanic Languages, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.
- Allen, Edward Archibald, Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
- Allen, F. Sturges, Springfield, Mass. [246 Central St.]
- Allen, Philip Schuyler, Assistant Professor of German Literature, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [5718 Madison Ave.]
- Almstedt, Hermann, Professor of Germanic Languages, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
- Andrews, Albert Le Roy, Instructor in German and Scandinavian, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. [508 University Ave.]
- Andrist, Charles Martin, Assistant Professor of French, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. [228 Folwell Hall.]
- Ansley, C. F., Professor of English, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.
- Armes, William Dallam, Assistant Professor of English Literature, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. [Faculty Club.]

- Armstrong, Edward C., Professor of the French Language, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
- Armstrong, Edwin Stanley, Acting Head of the English Department, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
- Artmann, Florentine E., Instructor in German, Normal College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [828 Lexington Ave.]
- Axson, Stockton, Professor of English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Aydelotte, Frank, Associate Professor of English, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
- Ayer, Charles Carlton, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Colorado, Boulder, Col.
- Ayres, Harry Morgan, Lecturer in English, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [507 Fayerweather Hall.]
- Babbitt, Irving, Assistant Professor of French, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [6 Kirkland Road.]
- Babcock, Earle Brownell, Instructor in French, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [5546 Madison Ave.]
- Babson, Herman, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
- Bagster-Collins, Elijah William, Adjunct Professor of German, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Baillet, Edouard Paul, Professor of Romance Languages, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. [2109 Sherman Ave.]
- Baker, Asa George, G. & C. Merriam Co., Publishers of Webster's Dictionaries, Springfield, Mass.
- Baker, Franklin Thomas, Professor of English, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [525 W. 120th St.]
- Baker, George Pierce, Professor of English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [195 Brattle St.]
- Baker, Harry Torsey, Assistant Professor of English Literature, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. [Chapin Hall.]
- Baker, Thomas Stockham, Head Master, Tome School for Boys, Jacob Tome Institute, Port Deposit, Md.
- Baldwin, Charles Sears, Professor of Rhetoric, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- Baldwin, Edward Chauncey, Assistant Professor of English Literature, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [1002 S. Lincoln Ave.]
- Bargy, Henry, Professor of the French Language and Literature, Normal College of the City of New York, 68th St. and Park Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Barnes, Frank Coe, Professor of Modern Languages, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

- Bartlett, Mrs. D. L., Baltimore, Md. [16 W. Monument St.]
- Baskervill, Charles Read, Instructor in English, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
- Bassett, Ralph Emerson, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas.
- Batt, Max, Professor of Modern Languages, North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. D.
- Battin, Benjamin F., Professor of German, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
- Baumgartner, Milton D., Adjunct Professor of Germanic Languages and Literature, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
- Baur, William F., Instructor in German, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
- Beach, Joseph Warren, Assistant Professor of English, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Beam, Jacob, Preceptor in Modern Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Beatty, Arthur, Assistant Professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [1824 Jackson St.]
- de Beaumont, Victor, Associate Professor of the French Language and Literature, Victoria College, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.
- Bechert, Alexander Otto, Tutor in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [464 Bainbridge St., Brooklyn, N. Y.]
- Becker, Ernest Julius, Principal, Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.
- Becker, Wilhelmina Marie, Professor of German, Penn College, Oscaloosa, Ia.
- Belden, Henry Marvin, Professor of English, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. [811 Virginia Ave.]
- Bell, Robert Mowry, Assistant Professor of German, Clark College, Worcester, Mass.
- Benson, Adolph Burnett, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [808 Livingston Hall.]
- Berdan, John Milton, Instructor in Rhetoric, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- Bergeron, Maxime L., Tutor in French, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [505 W. 148th St.]
- Berkeley, Frances Campbell, Instructor in English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- Bernkopf, Margarete, Instructor in German, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. [58 Kensington Ave.]
- Bernstorff, Frank A., Instructor in German, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. [2241 Sherman Ave.]

- de Béthune, Baron F., Louvain, Belgium. [36 rue de Bériot.]
- Bevier, Louis, Jr., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
- Béziat de Bordes, André, Professor of French, Newcomb College, New Orleans, La.
- Bigelow, John, Jr., Professor of French and Head of the Department of Modern Languages, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
- Bigelow, William Pingry, Professor of Music and German, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
- Bingham, Rev. Joel Foote, Hartford, Conn. [484 Farmington Ave.]
- Bishop, David Horace, Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss. [University, Miss.]
- Blackburn, Francis Adelbert, Associate Professor of the English Language, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [333 E. 56th St.]
- Blackwell, Robert Emory, President and Professor of English, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.
- Blair, Emma Helen, Historical Editor, State Historical Library, Madison, Wis. [131 W. Gorham St.]
- Blaisdell, Daisy Luana, Instructor in German, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [903 S. Busey Ave.]
- Blanchard, Frederic Thomas, Instructor in English, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
- Blayney, T. Lindsey, Director of the Department of European Literature and the History of European Art, Central University of Kentucky, Danville, Ky.
- Blau, Max F., Assistant Professor of German, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Bleyer, Willard Grosvenor, Assistant Professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [625 Langdon St.]
- Boesche, Albert Wilhelm, Instructor in German, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [322 Harvard St.]
- Bohn, William Edward, Instructor in Rhetoric, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [718 Monroe St.]
- Boll, Helene Hubertine, Instructor in German, Hillhouse High School, New Haven, Conn.
- Bonilla, Rodrigo Huguet, Instructor in French and Spanish, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.
- Borgerhoff, J. L., Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.
- Both-Hendriksen, Louise, Assistant Professor of History, Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y. [150 Lefferts Place.]
- Bothne, Gisle C. J., Professor of Scandinavian Languages and Literatures, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

- Boucke, Ewald A., Assistant Professor of German, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Bourland, Benjamin Parsons, Professor of Romance Languages, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. [11500 Euclid Ave.]
- Bowen, Benjamin Lester, Professor of Romance Languages, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
- Bowen, Edwin Winfield, Professor of Latin, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.
- Bowen, James Vance, Professor of Foreign Languages, Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College, Agricultural College, Miss.
- Boysen, Johannes Lassen, Professor of Germanic Philology, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. [714 So. Beech St.]
- Bradshaw, S. Ernest, Professor of Modern Languages, Furman University, Greenville, S. C.
- Bradsher, Earl L., Instructor in English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- Brandon, Edgar Ewing, Vice-President and Professor of Romanic Languages and Literatures, Miami University, Oxford, O. [201 E. Church St.]
- Brandt, Hermann Carl Georg, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
- Braun, Frederick Augustus, Instructor in German, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. [319 Davenport St.]
- Braun, Wilhelm Alfred, Instructor in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Brede, Charles F., Professor of German, Northeast Manual Training High School, Lehigh Ave. and 8th St., Philadelphia, Pa. [1943 N. Camac St.]
- Briggs, Fletcher, Professor of Modern Languages, Iowa State College, Ames, Ia.
- Briggs, Thomas H., Professor of English, Eastern Illinois State Normal School, Charleston, Ill.
- Briggs, William Dinsmore, Assistant Professor of English, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.
- Bright, James Wilson, Professor of English Philology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
- Bristol, Edward N., Henry Holt & Co., New York, N. Y. [29 West 23d St.]
- Bronk, Isabelle, Professor of the French Language and Literature, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
- Bronson, Thomas Bertrand, Head of the Modern Language Department, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.

- Bronson, Walter C., Professor of English Literature, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
- Brooks, Neil C., Assistant Professor of German, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- Brown, Arthur C. L., Professor of English Literature, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. [815 Colfax St.]
- Brown, Calvin S., Professor of Romance Languages, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss. [University, Miss.]
- Brown, Carleton F., Associate Professor of English, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
- Brown, Frederic Willis, Professor of Modern Languages, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
- Brown, George Dobbin, Instructor in English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [17 Alexander St.]
- Brown, Rollo Walter, Professor of Rhetoric, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. [607 S. Water St.]
- Brownell, George Griffin, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Alabama, University, Ala.
- Bruce, Charles A., Professor of Romance Languages, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. [1981 Indianola Ave.]
- Bruce, James Douglas, Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
- Brugnot, Mrs. Alice Gabrielle Twilight, Head of the French Department, University School for Girls, Chicago, Ill. [21 Lake Shore Drive.]
- Brumbaugh, Martin Grove, Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, Pa. [3324 Walnut St.]
- Brun, Alphonse, Instructor in French, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [39 Ellery St.]
- Bruner, James Dowden, President, Chowan Institute, Murfreesboro, N. C.
- Bruns, Friedrich, Instructor in German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [424 Frances St.]
- Brush, Henry Raymond, Professor of Modern Languages, Hope College, Holland, Mich. [609 State St.]
- Brush, Murray Peabody, Associate Professor of French, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
- Bryant, Frank Egbert, Assistant Professor of English, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas.
- Buchanan, Milton Alexander, Lecturer in Italian and Spanish, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. [124 McPherson Ave.]
- Buck, Gertrude, Professor of English, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- Buck, Philo Melvyn, Jr., Head of the Department of English, McKinley High School, St. Louis, Mo.

- Buckingham, Mary H., Boston, Mass. [96 Chestnut St.]
- Buffum, Douglas Labaree, Preceptor in Romance Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Burkhard, Oscar Carl, Assistant Professor of German, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Burnet, Percy Bentley, Director of Modern Languages, Manual Training High School, Kansas City, Mo. [1112 E. 14th St.]
- Burnett, Arthur W., Henry Holt & Co., New York, N. Y. [29 West 23d St.]
- Burnham, Josephine M., Instructor in English Composition, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. [1304 Chapel St., New Haven, Conn.]
- Burton, Richard, Professor of English Literature, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. [2109 Blaisdell Ave.]
- Busey, Robert Oscar, Instructor in German, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
- Bush, Stephen Hayes, Professor of French, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.
- Busse, Paul Gustav Adolf, Instructor in German, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. [316 W. Ninth Ave.]
- Butler, Pierce, Professor of English, Newcomb College, New Orleans, La.
- Cabeen, Charles William, Professor of Romance Languages, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
- Cady, Frank William, Assistant Professor of English, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
- Callaway, Morgan, Jr., Professor of English, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. [1104 Guadalupe St.]
- Camera, Amerigo Ulysses N., Instructor in French, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [575 West Ave., Flatbush, Brooklyn, N. Y.]
- Cameron, Arnold Guyot, Princeton, N. J.
- Campbell, Charles Diven, Assistant Professor of German, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
- Campbell, J. A., Instructor in German, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas.
- Campbell, Killis, Adjunct Professor of English, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. [2301 Rio Grande St.]
- Campion, John L., New York, N. Y. [370 W. 116th St.]
- Canby, Henry Seidel, Assistant Professor of English, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [105 Mansfield St.]

- Canfield, Arthur Graves, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [909 E. University Ave.]
- Capen, Samuel Paul, Professor of Modern Languages, Clark College, Worcester, Mass.
- Carnahan, David Hobart, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.
- Carpenter, Frederic Ives, Associate Professor of English, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [Barrington, Ill.]
- Carpenter, William Henry, Professor of Germanic Philology, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Carr, Muriel Bothwell, Head of the Department of the English Language and Literature, Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.
- Carruth, William Herbert, Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas.
- Carson, Lucy Hamilton, Professor of English, Montana State Normal College, Dillon, Mont.
- Carson, Luella Clay, Professor of Rhetoric and American Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. [289 E. 9th St.]
- Carteaux, Gustave A., Professor of the French Language, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Carter, Charles Henry, Assistant Professor of English, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. [1005 Walnut Ave.]
- Castegnier, Georges, Civilian Instructor in French, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., and Lecturer for the Board of Education of New York, Newark, and Jersey City. [100 W. 117th St., New York, N. Y.]
- Cave, Charles E., Head of the Department of German, Idaho State Normal School, Albion, Idaho.
- Cerf, Barry, Instructor in Romance Languages, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- Chamberlain, May, Instructor in Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. [Station A.]
- Chamberlin, Willis Arden, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Denison University, Granville, O.
- Chandler, Edith Beatrice, Instructor in French and German, Huron College, Huron, S. D. [467 Illinois St.]
- Chandler, Frank Wadleigh, Professor of English, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. [22 Orange St.]
- Chapman, Henry Leland, Professor of English Literature, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
- Charles, Arthur M., Professor of German and French, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
- Chase, Frank Herbert, Professor of English Literature, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. [718 Church St.]

- Chase, Lewis Nathaniel, Professor of English, University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky. [14 rue Duplessis, Bordeaux, France.]
- Chatfield-Taylor, Herbert C., Lake Forest, Ill.
- Cheek, Samuel Robertson, Professor of Latin, Central University of Kentucky, Danville, Ky.
- Cheever, Louisa Sewall, Instructor in English, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. [Chapin House.]
- Chenery, Winthrop Holt, Assistant Professor of Spanish and Italian, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
- Cherington, Frank Barnes, Instructor in English, University High School, Chicago, Ill.
- Child, Clarence Griffin, Professor of English, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. [4237 Sansom St.]
- Chiles, James Alburn, Instructor in German, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- Chinard, Gilbert, Instructor in French, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
- Churchill, George Bosworth, Professor of English Literature, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
- Churchman, Philip Hudson, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Clark College, Worcester, Mass. [21 Shirley St.]
- Claassen, Peter A., Professor of Modern Languages, Ohio University, Athens, O.
- Clapp, John Mantel, Professor of English, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.
- Clark, J. Scott, Professor of English, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
- Clark, Thatcher, Head of the Department of Modern Languages, Cathedral School of St. Paul, Garden City, N. Y.
- Clark, Thomas Arkle, Professor of Rhetoric and Dean of Undergraduates, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- Clarke, Charles Cameron, Jr., Professor of French, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [254 Bradley St.]
- Clary, S. Willard, D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, Mass. [120 Boylston St.]
- Clementine, Sister M., Teacher of English, Saint Clara College, Sinsinawa, Wis.
- Clemons, William Harry, Reference Librarian, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Coar, John Firman, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Cobb, Parker, Associate Professor of German, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
- Cohn, Adolphe, Professor of the Romance Languages and Literatures, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

- Colin, Mrs. Henriette Louise Thérèse, Professor of the French Language and Literature, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
- Collings, Harry T., Instructor in German, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [641 Yale Station.]
- Collins, George Stuart, Professor of German and Spanish, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. [Wyckoff, N. J.]
- Collins, Varnum Lansing, Preceptor in Modern Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Collitz, Hermann, Professor of Germanic Philology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
- Colville, William T., Carbondale, Pa.
- Colwell, William Arnold, Professor of French and German, Wofford College, Spartansburg, S. C. [489 E. Main St.]
- Comfort, William Wistar, Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Compton, Alfred D., Tutor in English, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Conant, Martha Pike, Head of the Department of English Language and Literature, Woman's College, Frederick, Md.
- Condit, Lola M., Assistant Professor of German, Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia.
- Conklin, Clara, Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
- Cook, Albert S., Professor of the English Language and Literature, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [219 Bishop St.]
- Cool, Charles Dean, Instructor in Romance Languages, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [2022 Jefferson St.]
- Cooper, Lane, Assistant Professor of the English Language and Literature, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. [Cornell Heights.]
- Cooper, William Alpha, Assistant Professor of German, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.
- Corbin, William Lee, Associate Professor of English, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.
- Corwin, Robert Nelson, Professor of German, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [247 St. Ronan St.]
- Coues, Robert Wheaton, Assistant in English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [10 Mason St.]
- Cox, Edward Godfrey, Instructor in English, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Cox, John Harrington, Professor of English Philology, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va. [188 Spruce St.]
- Craig, Hardin, Preceptor in English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [52 University Place.]

- Crawford, Douglas, Fellow in English Literature, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. [825 Hamlin St.]
- Crawford, James Pyle Wickersham, Instructor in Romanic Languages and Literatures, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Crawshaw, William Henry, Dean and Professor of English Literature, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.
- Critchlow, Frank Linley, Preceptor in Romance Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Croll, Morris William, Preceptor in English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [53 Patton Hall.]
- Cross, Wilbur Lucius, Professor of English, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [24 Edgehill Road.]
- Crowell, Asa Clinton, Associate Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures, Brown University, Providence, R. I. [345 Hope St.]
- Crowne, Joseph Vincent, Instructor in English, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Cunliffe, John William, Professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- Curdy, Albert Eugene, Assistant Professor of French, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [743 Yale Station.]
- Curme, George Oliver, Professor of Germanic Philology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. [629 Colfax St.]
- Cushwa, Frank William, Instructor in English, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
- Cutting, Starr Willard, Professor and Head of the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Daland, Rev. William Clifton, President and Professor of English and Philosophy, Milton College, Milton, Rock Co., Wis.
- Dallam, Mary Therese, Teacher of English, Western High School, Baltimore, Md. [307 Dolphin St.]
- Damon, Lindsay Todd, Professor of Rhetoric, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
- Daniels, Francis Potter, Professor of Romance Languages, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. [503 W. Wabash Ave.]
- Danton, George Henry, Acting Assistant Professor of German, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.
- Dargan, Edwin Preston, Adjunct Professor of Romanic Languages, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
- Darnall, Frank Mauzy, Assistant Professor of English, Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College, Agricultural College, Miss.

- Darnall, Henry Johnston, Professor of Modern Languages, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
- Davidson, Frederic Joseph Arthur, Associate Professor of Italian and Spanish, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. [22 Madison Ave.]
- Davies, William Walter, Professor of the German Language, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.
- Davis, Edward Ziegler, Instructor in German, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. [3223 Powelton Ave.]
- Deering, Robert Waller, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. [1130 Bellflower Road.]
- De Haan, Fonger, Professor of Spanish, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
- Deister, John Lewis, Assistant Professor of Modern Languages, Mississippi State University, Oxford, Miss.
- De Lagneau, Lea Rachel, Instructor in Romance Languages, Lewis Institute, Chicago, Ill.
- Delamarre, Louis, Instructor in French, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [324 Highland Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.]
- Denney, Joseph Villiers, Professor of English and Dean of the College of Arts, Philosophy, and Science, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
- Dey, William Morton, Professor of Romance Languages, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
- Diekhoff, Tobias J. C., Junior Professor of German, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Dingus, L. R., Professor of Modern Languages, State Normal College, Florence, Ala.
- Dodge, Daniel Kilham, Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.
- Dodge, Robert Elkin Neil, Assistant Professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [15 W. Gorham St.]
- Doniat, Josephine C., Instructor in French and German, Lyons Township High School, La Grange, Ill.
- Douay, Gaston, Professor of French, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
- Dow, Louis Henry, Professor of French, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Downer, Charles Alfred, Professor of the French Language and Literature, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.

- Dürst, Marie, Teacher of Modern Languages, Steele High School, Dayton, O. [152 Eagle St.]
- Dunlap, Charles Graham, Professor of English Literature, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas.
- Dunn, Joseph, Associate Professor of Celtic Languages and Lecturer in Romance Languages, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
- Dupouey, Robert, Assistant Professor of French, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. [1943 Rose St.]
- Dye, Alexander Vincent, American Consul, Nogales, Mexico.
- van Dyke, Henry, Professor of English Literature, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Eastman, Clarence Willis, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
- Easton, Morton William, Professor of English and Comparative Philology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. [224 S. 43rd St.]
- Eaton, Mrs. Abbie Fiske, Principal, Friedeneck School, Pasadena, Cal.
- Eaton, Horace A., Associate Professor of English, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. [607 Walnut Ave.]
- Eckelmann, Ernst Otto, Cambridge, Mass. [48 Irving St.]
- Edgar, Pelham, Professor of the French Language and Literature, Victoria College, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.
- Effinger, John Robert, Junior Professor of French, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Eggert, Carl Edgar, Assistant Professor of German, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [930 Church St.]
- Elliott, A. Marshall, Professor of Romance Languages, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. [1028 N. Calvert St.]
- Elliott, George Roy, Instructor in English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [616 Lake St.]
- Emerson, Oliver Farrar, Professor of English, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. [98 Wadena St., E. Cleveland, O.]
- Erskine, John, Adjunct Professor of English, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Evans, Marshall Blakemore, Associate Professor of German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [21 Mendota Court.]
- Evers, Helene M., Instructor in Romance Languages, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
- Ewart, Frank Carman, Professor of Romance Languages, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.
- Fahnestock, Edith, Instructor in Romance Languages, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

- Fairchild, Arthur Henry Rolph**, Assistant Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. [911 Lowery St.]
- Fairchild, J. R.**, American Book Co., New York, N. Y. [Washington Square.]
- Farley, Frank Edgar**, Professor of English, Simmons College, Boston, Mass.
- Farnsworth, William Oliver**, Professor of Modern Languages, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
- Farr, Hollon A.**, Assistant Professor of German, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [351 White Hall.]
- Farrand, Wilson**, Head Master, Newark Academy, Newark, N. J.
- Farrar, Thomas James**, Professor of Modern Languages, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
- Faust, Albert Bernhardt**, Assistant Professor of German, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. [University Place.]
- Fay, Charles Ernest**, Professor of Modern Languages, Tufts College, Tufts College, Mass.
- Feise, K. W. R. Ernst**, Instructor in German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [1715 Adams St.]
- Ferrell, Chiles Clifton**, Professor of Germanic Languages, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss. [University, Miss.]
- Ferren, Harry M.**, Professor of German, High School, Allegheny, Pa.
- Few, William Preston**, Professor of English, Trinity College, Durham, N. C.
- Fielder, Edwin W.**, Editor, D. Appleton & Co., New York, N. Y. [436 Fifth Ave.]
- Fife, Robert Herndon, Jr.**, Professor of German, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. [240 College St.]
- Files, George Taylor**, Professor of German, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
- Fiske, Christabel Forsyth**, Instructor in English, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- Fitz-Gerald, John Driscoll**, Assistant Professor of the Romance Languages, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- Fitz-Hugh, Thomas**, Professor of Latin, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
- Fletcher, Jefferson Butler**, Professor of Comparative Literature, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [112 E. 22d St.]
- Fletcher, Robert Huntington**, Acting Professor of English Literature, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia.
- Flom, George Tobias**, Assistant Professor of Scandinavian Languages and Literatures, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [611 W. Green St.]

- Florer, Warren Washburn, Assistant Professor of German, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [910 Olivia Place.]
- Fluegel, Ernst J., Instructor in German, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. [715 E. Buffalo St.]
- Fogg, Miller Moore, Professor of Rhetoric, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
- Ford, Daniel, Adjunct Professor of Rhetoric and Composition, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. [1712 E St.]
- Ford, J. D. M., Professor of the French and Spanish Languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [57 Brewster St.]
- Ford, Joseph Sherman, Instructor in German, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
- Ford, R. Clyde, Professor of Modern Languages, State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich.
- Fortier, Alcée, Professor of Romance Languages, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La. [1241 Esplanade Ave.]
- Fortier, Edward J., Associate in Romance Languages, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [908 W. Nevada St.]
- Fossler, Laurence, Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
- Foster, Irving Lysander, Professor of Romance Languages, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
- Foulet, Lucien, Professor of the French Language and Literature, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
- Fowler, Thomas Howard, Professor of German, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.
- Fox, Charles Shattuck, Assistant Professor of Modern Languages, Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pa. [222 Wall St., Bethlehem.]
- Francke, Kuno, Professor of the History of German Culture and Curator of the Germanic Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [3 Berkeley Place.]
- François, Victor Emmanuel, Associate Professor of French, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [140th St. and Convent Ave.]
- Frank, Colman Dudley, Head Assistant in Romance Languages, De Witt Clinton High School, 59th St. and Tenth Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Fraser, Margaret E. N., Dean of Women and Head of the Department of Romance Languages, Alleghany College, Meadville, Pa. [Hulings Hall.]
- Fraser, William Henry, Professor of Italian and Spanish, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.
- Froelicher, Hans, Professor of German, Woman's College of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md.

- Fruit, John Phelps, Professor of the English Language and Literature, William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.
- Fuentes, Ventura, Instructor in Spanish, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Fuller, Harold DeWolf, Instructor in Comparative Literature, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [45 Brentford Hall.]
- Fuller, Paul, New York, N. Y. [71 Broadway.]
- Fulton, Edward, Associate Professor of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- Fulton, Maurice Garland, Professor of English, Davidson College, Davidson, N. C.
- Furst, Clyde B., Secretary of Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Galloo, Eugénie, Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas.
- Galpin, Stanley Leman, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
- Gardiner, John Hays, Assistant Professor of English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [18 Grays Hall.]
- Garrett, Alfred Cope, Philadelphia, Pa. [525 Locust Ave., Germantown.]
- Garver, Milton Stahl, Instructor in French, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [811 Yale Station.]
- Gauss, Christian Frederick, Professor of Modern Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [106 Fitz Randolph Road.]
- Gaw, Mrs. Ralph H., Topeka, Kas. [1321 Filmore St.]
- Gay, Lucy Maria, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [216 N. Pinckney St.]
- Gayley, Charles Mills, Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. [2403 Piedmont Ave.]
- Geddes, James, Jr., Professor of Romance Languages, Boston University, Boston, Mass. [20 Fairmont St., Brookline, Mass.]
- Geissendoerfer, John Theodore, Assistant in German, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. [College Hall.]
- Gerig, John Lawrence, Lecturer in Romance Languages and Celtic Philology, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Gerould, Gordon Hall, Preceptor in English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Gildersleeve, Virginia Crocheron, Lecturer in English, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [28 W. 48th St.]
- Gill, John Glanville, Professor of Romance Languages, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

- Gillett, William Kendall, Professor of French and Spanish, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.
- Glascok, Clyde Chew, Assistant Professor of German, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [Graduates' Club.]
- Glen, Irving M., Professor of the English Language and Early English Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. [254 E. 9th St.]
- Goad, Caroline M., Teacher of German, Wilson College for Women, Chambersburg, Pa.
- Goddard, Harold Clarke, Professor of English, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
- Goebel, Julius, Professor of German, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- Goettsch, Charles, Instructor in German, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Goodnight, Scott Holland, Assistant Professor of German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [619 Harrison St.]
- Gordon, Arthur, Instructor in Romance Languages, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. [604 E. Buffalo St.]
- Gould, Chester Nathan, Instructor in German, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Gould, William Elford, New York, N. Y. [58 E. 25th St.]
- Grandgent, Charles Hall, Professor of Romance Languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [107 Walker St.]
- Graves, William Lucius, Assistant Professor of English, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
- Gray, Charles Henry, Assistant Professor of English, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas. [1000 Ohio St.]
- Greene, Ernest Roy, Assistant Professor of French and Spanish, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. [Box 114.]
- Greene, Herbert Eveleth, Collegiate Professor of English, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. [1019 St. Paul St.]
- Greenfield, Eric V., Instructor in German, Purdue University, La Fayette, Ind. [709 Kossuth St.]
- Greenlaw, Edwin Almiron, Professor of English, Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Greenough, Chester Noyes, Professor of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [1109 W. California Ave.]
- Gregor, Leigh R., Associate Professor of Modern Languages, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. [139 Baile St.]
- Griebisch, Max, Director, National German-American Teachers' Seminary, 558-568 Broadway, Milwaukee, Wis.
- Griffin, James O., Professor of German, Leland Stanford Jr., University, Stanford University, Cal.

- Griffin, Nathaniel Edward, Preceptor in English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [14 N. Dod Hall.]
- Grimm, Karl Josef, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
- Gronow, Hans Ernst, Associate in German, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Groth, Catherine D., New York, N. Y. [346 Broadway.]
- Gruener, Gustav, Professor of German, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [146 Lawrance Hall.]
- Grumbine, Harvey Carson, Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of Wooster, Wooster, O.
- Grumann, Paul H., Professor of Modern German Literature, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. [1930 Washington St.]
- Guérard, Albert Léon, Assistant Professor of the Romance Languages, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.
- Guerlac, Othon G., Assistant Professor of French, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Guitéras, Calixto, Professor of Spanish, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Guitner, Alma, Professor of German, Otterbein University, Westerville, O.
- Gummere, Francis B., Professor of English, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
- Gutknecht, Louise L., Teacher of German and French, South Chicago High School, Chicago, Ill. [7700 Bond Ave., Windsor Park, Chicago.]
- Hale, Edward E., Jr., Professor of English, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
- Hall, John Lesslie, Professor of the English Language and Literature and of General History, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.
- Ham, Roscoe James, Professor of German, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
- Hamill, Alfred Ernest, Ballyatwood, Lake Forest, Ill.
- Hamilton, George Livingstone, Instructor in Romance Languages, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [726 S. State St.]
- Hamilton, Theodore Ely, Instructor in Romance Languages, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. [1111 University Ave.]
- Hammond, Eleanor Prescott, Chicago, Ill. [1357 E. 57th St.]
- Hancock, Albert E., Assistant Professor of English, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
- Handschin, Charles Hart, Professor of German, Miami University, Oxford, O.

- Haney, John Louis, Professor of English Philology, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Hardy, Ashley Kingley, Assistant Professor of German and Instructor in Old English, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Hare, James Alexander, Forstmann and Hoffmann Co., Passaic, N. J.
- Hargrove, Henry Lee, Professor of English, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.
- Harper, George McLean, Professor of English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Harris, Charles, Professor of German, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.
- Harris, Lancelot Minor, Professor of English, College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C.
- Harrison, James Albert, Professor of Teutonic Languages, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
- Harrison, John Smith, Assistant Professor of English, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
- Harry, Philip Warner, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. [Oakland, Pittsburgh.]
- Hart, Charles Edward, Professor of Ethics and Evidences of Christianity, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. [33 Livingston Ave.]
- Hart, James Morgan, Professor Emeritus of the English Language and Literature, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Hart, Walter Morris, Assistant Professor of English, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. [2255 Piedmont Ave.]
- Hastings, William Thomson, Instructor in English, Brown University, Providence, R. I. [11½ John St.]
- Hatcher, Orie Latham, Lecturer in Elizabethan Literature, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
- Hatfield, James Taft, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
- Hathaway, Charles Montgomery, Jr., Instructor in English, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. [183 King George St.]
- Hauhart, William F., Instructor in German, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [1115 S. University Ave.]
- Hauschild, George William, Instructor in German, University of Chicago High School, Chicago, Ill. [75 Hitchcock Hall.]
- Hausknecht, Emil, Professor at the University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Havens, Raymond Dexter, Instructor in English, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
- Head, Walter Dutton, Instructor in French, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.

- Heller, Otto, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
- Helmholtz-Phelan, Mrs. Anna Augusta, Instructor in English, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Hempl, George, Professor of Germanic Philology, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal. [382 Lincoln Ave.]
- Henning, George Neely, Professor of Romance Languages, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
- Herford, Charles Harold, Professor in the University of Manchester, Manchester, England.
- Herrick, Asbury Haven, Master in German, Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Hersey, Frank Wilson Cheney, Instructor in English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [61 Oxford St.]
- Hervey, Wm. Addison, Adjunct Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Heuser, Frederick W. J., Tutor in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Hewett, Waterman Thomas, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. [Netherby, Cornell Heights.]
- Heyd, Jacob Wilhelm, Professor of German and French, Kirksville State Normal School, Kirksville, Mo. [1112 S. Florence Ave.]
- Hicks, Fred Cole, Instructor in German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [Tipton, Ia.]
- Hill, Albert Ellsworth, Associate Instructor in English, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Hill, Raymond Thompson, Instructor in French, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [742 Yale Station.]
- Hills, Elijah Clarence, Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Col. [120 Tyler Place.]
- Hilmer, William Charles, Instructor in German, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. [213 W. Lorain St.]
- Hinckley, Henry Barrett, Northampton, Mass. [54 Prospect St.]
- Hinsdale, Ellen C., Professor of the German Language and Literature, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
- Hochdörfer, Karl Friedrich Richard, Professor of Modern Languages, Wittenberg College, Springfield, O. [32 W. College Ave.]
- Hodder, Mrs. Alfred, Baltimore, Md. [33 E. Mt. Vernon Place.]
- Hodell, Charles Wesley, Professor of the English Language and Literature, Woman's College of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md.
- Hohlfeld, Alexander R., Professor of German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

- Holbrook, Richard Thayer, Associate Professor of Old French and Italian, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
- Hollander, Lee M., Instructor in German, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Holzwarth, Franklin James, Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. [911 Walnut Ave.]
- Hopkins, Annette Brown, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [Beecher Hall.]
- Hopkins, Edwin Mortimer, Professor of Rhetoric and the English Language, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas.
- Horne, Charles F., Assistant Professor of English, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [616 West 148th St.]
- Horning, L. Emerson, Professor of Teutonic Philology, Victoria College, Toronto, Canada.
- Hoskins, John Preston, Assistant Professor of German, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [22 Bank St.]
- Hospes, Mrs. Cecilia Lizzette, Teacher of German, McKinley High School, St. Louis, Mo.
- House, Ralph Emerson, Instructor in Romance Languages, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Howard, Albert A., Professor of Latin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [12 Walker St.]
- Howard, William Guild, Instructor in German, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [25 Conant Hall.]
- Howe, George Maxwell, Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Col. [1623 N. Tejon St.]
- Howe, Malvina A., Principal, Miss Howe and Miss Marot's School, Dayton, O. [513 W. 1st St.]
- Howe, Thomas Carr, President and Professor of German, Butler College, Indianapolis, Ind. [48 S. Audubon Road.]
- Howe, Will David, Professor of English, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
- Hoyt, Prentiss Cheney, Assistant Professor of English, Clark College, Worcester, Mass. [940 Main St.]
- Hrbkova (Hrbek), Šárka, Head of the Department of Slavonic Languages and Literatures, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. [Station A.]
- Hubbard, Frank G., Professor of the English Language, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- Hudnall, Richard Henry, Professor of English, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.
- Hughes, Mrs. Charlotte Condé, Director of French, Moffitt School, Grand Rapids, Mich. [18 S. Lafayette St.]

Hulme, William Henry, Professor of English, College for Women, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. [11424 Mayfield St.]

Hume, Thomas, Professor Emeritus of English Literature, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Hunt, Theodore Whitefield, Professor of English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Hyde, James Hazen, New York, N. Y. [11 E. 40th St.]

Ibbotson, Joseph Darling, Jr., Professor of English Literature, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

Ilgen, Ernest, Associate Professor of German, College of the City of New York, 138th St., and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.

Ingraham, Edgar Shugert, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.

Jackson, M. Katherine, Lecturer in English, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

von Jagemann, H. C. G., Professor of Germanic Philology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [113 Walker St.]

Jenkins, T. Atkinson, Associate Professor of French Philology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [488 E. 54th Place.]

Jessen, Karl Detlev, Associate Professor of German, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Jodocius, Albert, French Master, Delancey School, Philadelphia, Pa. [1420 Pine St.]

Johnson, Henry, Professor of Modern Languages, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.

Johnson, William Savage, Assistant Professor of English Literature, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas. [1108 Tennessee St.]

Johnston, Oliver Martin, Associate Professor of Romanic Languages, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.

Jonas, J. B. E., Assistant Professor of German, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

Jones, Everett S'arr, Head Master, Allen School, West Newton, Mass.

Jones, Florence Nightingale, Instructor in French and Italian, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [901 W. Green St.]

Jones, Harrie Stuart Vedder, Associate in English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [1010 W. Oregon St.]

Jones, Jessie Louise, Assistant Professor of German, Lewis Institute, Chicago, Ill.

Jones, Richard, Professor of English, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Jordan, Daniel, Adjunct Professor of the Romance Languages and Literatures, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

- Jordan, Mary Augusta, Professor of the English Language and Literature, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. [Hatfield House.]
- Joynes, Edward S., Professor Emeritus of Modern Languages, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
- Julian, Arthur Nelson, Instructor in German and Greek, Elgin Academy, Elgin, Ill. [47 Julian St.]
- Kahn, J. Ottillie, Cañon City, Col. [925 Rudd Ave.]
- Keidel, George Charles, Associate in Romance Languages, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
- Kellogg, Robert James, Professor of Modern Languages, James Millikin University, Decatur, Ill.
- Kent, Charles W., Professor of English Literature, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
- Keppler, Emil A. C., Tutor in Germanic Languages and Literature, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [214 Drake Ave., New Rochelle, N. Y.]
- Kerlin, Robert Thomas, Professor of English Literature, Virginia State Normal School, Farmville, Va.
- Kern, Alfred Allan, Professor of English, Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.
- Kerr, William Alexander Robb, Professor of Modern Languages, University of Alberta, Strathcona, Alberta, Canada.
- Keyes, Charles Reuben, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia.
- Keys, David Reid, Associate Professor of Anglo-Saxon, University College, Toronto, Canada.
- Kinard, James Pinckney, Professor of the English Language and Literature, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C.
- Kind, John Louis, Assistant Professor of German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [The Irving, Sterling Court.]
- King, Robert Augustus, Professor of French and German, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.
- Kingsbury, Elizabeth, Teacher of German and Latin, Nebraska Normal College, Wayne, Neb.
- Kip, Herbert Z., Associate Professor of German, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
- Kirchner, Elida Caroline, Instructor in German, Central High School, St. Louis, Mo. [1127 N. Grand Ave.]
- Kittredge, George Lyman, Professor of English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [8 Hilliard St.]
- Kittredge, Rupert E. L., Assistant Instructor in French, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

- Klaeber, Frederick, Professor of English Philology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Klein, David, Tutor in English, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.
- von Klenze, Camillo, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
- Knapp, Thad J., Principal, Kearney High School, Kearney, N. J.
- Knoepfler, John Baptist, Professor and Head of the Department of German and French, Iowa State Teachers' College, Cedar Falls, Ia.
- Koehler, Hugo Wilhelm, Instructor in German, State University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. [157 East St.]
- Krapp, George Philip, Professor of English, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
- Krieger, Herbert William, Assistant, Department of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [402 E. Stoughton St., Champaign, Ill.]
- Kroeh, Charles F., Professor of Modern Languages, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J.
- Krowl, Harry C., Assistant Professor of English, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Kruse, H. O., Instructor in German, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas.
- Kueffner, Louise Mallinckrodt, Instructor in German, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- Kuersteiner, Albert Frederick, Professor of Romance Languages, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
- Kuhns, Oscar, Professor of Romance Languages, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
- Kullmer, Charles Julius, Assistant Professor of German, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. [505 University Place.]
- Kurrelmeyer, William, Associate in German, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. [Ellicott City, Md.]
- Lambert, Marcus Bachman, Teacher of German, Richmond Hill High School, New York, N. Y. [5 Maxwell Ave., Jamaica, N. Y.]
- Lancaster, Henry Carrington, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
- Lang, Henry R., Professor of Romance Philology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [244 Yale Station.]
- Lange, Alexis Frederick, Professor of English and Scandinavian Philology, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. [2629 Haste St.]
- Lange, Carl Frederick Augustus, Associate Professor of German, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

- Langley, Ernest F., Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Lathrop, Henry Burrowes, Associate Professor of English Literature, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- Laubscher, Gustav G., Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va.
- Lavertu, Francis Louis, Head of the Modern Language Department, Hill School, Pottstown, Pa.
- Law, Robert A., Instructor in English, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
- Lawrence, William Witherle, Adjunct Professor of English, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Learned, Marion Dexter, Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Le Compte, Irville Charles, Assistant Professor of French, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [764 Yale Station.]
- Le Daum, Henry, Professor of Romance Languages, State University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. D. [6 New Hampshire Flats.]
- Le Duc, Alma de L., European Fellow, Association of Collegiate Alumnae, Paris, France. [Crédit Lyonnais, 16 Boulevard des Italiens.]
- Leonard, Arthur Newton, Professor of German, Bates College, Lewiston, Me. [24 Riverside St.]
- Leonard, Jonathan, Sub-Master (French), English High School, Somerville, Mass. [Sandwich, Mass.]
- Leonard, William Ellery, Instructor in English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [222 Langdon St.]
- Lessing, Otto Eduard, Associate Professor of German, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [1006 Nevada St.]
- Levi, Moritz, Professor of French, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Lewis, Charlton Miner, Professor of English Literature, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- Lewis, Edwin Herbert, Professor of English and Dean of the Faculty, Lewis Instituté, Chicago, Ill.
- Liberma, Marco F., Professor of Romance Languages, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
- Lieder, Frederick William Charles, Instructor in German, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [46 Holyoke St.]
- Lincoln, George Luther, Instructor in Romance Languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [44 Ware Hall.]
- Lindsay, George Clarence, Assistant in Spanish, McKinley High School, St. Louis, Mo.

- Livingston, Albert Arthur, Tutor in Romance Languages, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [West Hall.]
- Logeman, Henry, Professor of English Philology, University of Ghent, Ghent, Belgium. [343 boulevard des Hospices.]
- Loiseaux, Louis Auguste, Adjunct Professor of the Romance Languages and Literatures, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Lomax, John Avery, Associate Professor of English, The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station, Tex.
- Long, Percy Waldron, Instructor in English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [Care of J. J. Enneking, 17 Webster Sq., Hyde Park, Mass.]
- Longden, Henry B., Professor of the German Language and Literature, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
- Lorenz, Charlotte Marie, Instructor in German, Iowa State Teachers' College, Cedar Falls, Ia. [1021 W. 22d St.]
- Lotspeich, Claude M., Assistant Professor of German, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
- Loveland, Helen Isabel, Head of Department of English, Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia.
- Lowes, John Livingston, Professor of English, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
- Luebke, William Ferdinand, Chicago, Ill. [1005 E. 55th St.]
- Luquiens, Frederick Bliss, Assistant Professor of Spanish, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [595 Orange St.]
- Lustrat, Joseph, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
- Lutz, Frederick, Professor of Modern Languages and Acting Professor of Latin, Albion College, Albion, Mich.
- Lyman, Augustus Julian, Instructor in Ancient and Modern Languages, School of Music and Dramatic Art, Auditorium Building, Haywood St., Asheville, N. C.
- Lyon, Charles Edward, Instructor in Modern Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [Bachelors' Club.]
- Macarthur, John Robertson, Professor of English, New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Agricultural College, New Mexico.
- McBryde, John McLaren, Jr., Professor of English, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
- McClelland, George William, Tutor in English, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.
- MacClintock, William D., Professor of English, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [5629 Lexington Ave.]

- MacCracken, Henry Noble**, Instructor in English, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [180 East Rock Road.]
- MacDuffie, John**, Principal of the MacDuffie School for Girls, Springfield, Mass. [182 Central St.]
- McKenzie, Kenneth**, Assistant Professor of Italian, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- McKibben, George Fitch**, Professor of Romance Languages, Denison University, Granville, O.
- McKnight, George Harley**, Professor of English, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
- McLaughlin, William Aloysius**, Instructor in French, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [920 Monroe St.]
- McLean, Charlotte Frelinghuysen**, Professor of French and Greek, Albert Lea College, Albert Lea, Minn.
- MacLean, George Edwin**, President, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.
- McLouth, Lawrence A.**, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.
- MacMinn, George R.**, Instructor in English, Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Ames, Ia.
- Macnie, John**, Professor Emeritus of French and Spanish, University of North Dakota. [2113 Bryant Ave., S. Minneapolis, Minn.]
- Mallory, Herbert Samuel**, Instructor in Rhetoric, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Maloubier, Eugène F.**, Assistant Teacher (Romance Languages), High School of Commerce, W. 65th St., New York, N. Y.
- Manley, Edward**, Englewood High School, Chicago, Ill. [5801 Lexington Ave.]
- Manly, John Matthews**, Professor and Head of the Department of English, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Manthey-Zorn, Otto**, Assistant Professor of German, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
- March, Francis Andrew**, Professor Emeritus of the English Language and of Comparative Philology, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
- Marcou, Philippe Belknap**, Paris, France. [28 quai d'Orléans.]
- Marden,, Charles Carroll**, Professor of Spanish, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
- Marin La Meslée, A.**, Instructor in French, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
- Marsh, Arthur Richmond**, Vice-President, New York Cotton Exchange, New York, N. Y.
- Marsh, George Linnæus**, Instructor in English, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

- Marvin, Robert B.**, Head of the Department of Modern Languages, Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. [826 Marcy Ave.]
- Mather, Frank Jewett, Jr.**, *The Evening Post*, New York, N. Y.
- Mathews, Charles Engley**, Instructor in French, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Matthews, Brander**, Professor of Dramatic Literature, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [681 West End Ave.]
- Matzke, John E.**, Professor of Romanic Languages, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.
- Maynadier, Gustavus H.**, Instructor in English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [24 Fairfax Hall.]
- Mead, William Edward**, Professor of the English Language, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
- Meisnest, Frederick William**, Professor of German, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. [4705 Sixteenth Ave., N. E.]
- Mellen, Frederic Davis**, Instructor in English, Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College, Agricultural College, Miss.
- Mensel, Ernst Heinrich**, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
- Mercier, Louis J.**, Head Instructor in French, Francis Parker School, Chicago, Ill. [199 S. Throop St.]
- Metzinger, Leon**, Assistant in German, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Meyer, Edward Stockton**, Associate Professor of German, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. [94 Glenpark Place.]
- Meyer, George Henry**, Assistant Professor of the German Language and Literature, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [905 W. Green St.]
- Miles, Louis Wardlaw**, Preceptor in English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Miller, George Morey**, Associate Professor of English, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. [16 The Westmoreland, Mt. Auburn, Cincinnati.]
- Miller, Raymond Durbin**, Instructor in English, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
- Milwitzky, William**, Instructor in French, Barringer High School, Newark, N. J.
- Montgomery, Maud**, Head of the Department of Languages, College of Industrial Arts, Denton, Texas. [64 N. Locust St.]
- Moore, Alfred Austin**, Preceptor in Romance Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Moore, Clarence King**, Professor of Romanic Languages, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
- Moore, Olin Harris**, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [10 Sumner Road.]

- Moore, Robert Webber, Professor of German, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.
- Moore, Samuel, Instructor in English, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas. [103 A Fayerweather St., Cambridge, Mass.]
- Morgan, Bayard Quincy, Instructor in German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [708 State St.]
- Morley, Sylvanus Griswold, Baldwinville, Mass.
- Morrill, Clarence B., Instructor in Rhetoric, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [Seffner, Fla.]
- Morris, John, Professor of Germanic Languages, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
- Morrison, Frederic William, Instructor in French and Spanish, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. [Hotel Maryland.]
- Morton, Asa Henry, Professor of Romance Languages, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
- Morton, Edward P., Assistant Professor of English, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. [6116 Greenwood Ave., Chicago, Ill.]
- Moseley, Thomas Addis Emmet, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. [614 N. Howard St.]
- Moser, Lillian Virginia, Syracuse, N. Y. [812 S. West St.]
- Mosher, William Eugene, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.
- Mott, Lewis F., Professor of the English Language and Literature, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Moyse, Charles Ebenezer, Vice-Principal and Head of the English Department, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Mulfinger, George Abraham, Professor of German Literature and Philology, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
- Mutterer, Frederick Gilbert, Head of the Department of German, Indiana State Normal School, Terre Haute, Ind. [429 North Center St.]
- Myers, Clara Louise, Assistant Professor of English, College for Women, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.
- Nadal, Thomas William, Dean and Professor of English, Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.
- Nason, Arthur Huntington, Instructor in English, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.
- Neff, Theodore Lee, Assistant Professor of French, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Neidig, William J., Instructor in English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [435 Hawthorne Place.]
- Neilson, William Allan, Professor of English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [34 Kirkland St.]

- Nelson, Clara Albertine, Professor of French, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.
- Nettleton, George Henry, Assistant Professor of English, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [12 St. Ronan Terrace.]
- Neumann, Gustaf Julius, Assistant Instructor in German, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. [215 Davenport St.]
- Nevens, Charles Freeman, Instructor in Romance Languages, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.
- Newcomer, Alphonso Gerald, Professor of English, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal. [Box 894.]
- Newcomer, Charles Berry, Professor of Modern Languages, Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky. [335 N. Broadway.]
- Newport, Mrs. Clara Price, Instructor in Latin, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
- Newson, Henry Dorsey, President of the Newson Publishing Co., 18 E. 17th St., New York, N. Y.
- Nichols, Charles Washburn, Instructor in Rhetoric, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Nichols, Edwin Bryant, Professor of Romance Languages, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
- Nicklas, Peter, Instructor in German, Newark High School, Newark, N. J.
- Nitze, William Albert, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Nix, Amalie Ida Frances, Teacher of German, Mechanic Arts High School, St. Paul, Minn. [715 Laurel Ave.]
- Noble, Charles, Professor of the English Language and Rhetoric, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa. [1110 West St.]
- von Noé, Adolf Carl, Instructor in German Literature, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Noé, Rachel, Head of the French Department, Bayonne High School, Bayonne, N. J. [1005 W. 8th St.]
- Nollen, John S., President, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.
- Norris, Clarence Elnathan, Instructor in German, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
- Northup, Clark S., Assistant Professor of the English Language and Literature, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. [107 College Place.]
- Nykerk, John Bernard, Professor of the English Language and Literature, Hope College, Holland, Mich.
- Ogden, Philip, Assistant Professor of French Literature, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

cxviii MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION.

- O'Leary, Raphael Dorman, Associate Professor of English, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas. [1106 Louisiana St.]
- Oliver, Thomas Edward, Professor of Romanic Languages, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [912 W. California Ave.]
- Olmsted, Everett Ward, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. [730 University Ave.]
- Opdycke, Leonard Eckstein, New York, N. Y. [117 E. 69th St.]
- Osgood, Charles Grosvenor, Jr., Preceptor in English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Osthans, Carl W. F., Junior Professor of German, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. [417 S. Fess Ave.]
- Ott, John Henry, Professor of the English Language and Literature, College of the Northwestern University, Watertown, Wis.
- Owen, Edward Thomas, Professor of French and Linguistics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [614 State St.]
- Pace, Roy Bennett, Instructor in English, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
- Padelford, Frederick Morgan, Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. [University Station.]
- Page, Curtis Hidden, Professor of English Literature, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
- Palmer Arthur Hubbell,, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [149 E. Rock Road.]
- Palmer, Inez Ethel, Instructor in Latin, East Waterloo High School, Waterloo, Ia. [Station A.]
- Palmer, Philip Mason, Professor of Modern Languages, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa. [University Park.]
- Pancoast, Henry Spackman, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. [Springfield Ave.]
- Papot, Bénédict, Instructor in French, R. T. Crane Manual Training High School, Chicago, Ill. [507 S. Irving Ave.]
- Park, Clyde William, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [67 Oxford St.]
- Patterson, Arthur Sayles, Professor of French, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. [415 University Place.]
- Patterson, Shirley Gale, Fellow in Romance Languages, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Paton, Lucy Allen, Cambridge, Mass. [Care of Miss Alma Blount, Ypsilanti, Mich.]
- Paul, Mrs. Sarah Woodman, Principal, Kent Place School, Summit, N. J.

- Payne, Leonidas Warren, Jr., Instructor in English, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. [2104 Pearl St.]
- Pearson, Calvin Wasson, Wallingford, Pa.
- Peck, Mary Gray, Assistant Professor of English, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. [2412 Harriet Ave.]
- Pellissier, Adeline, Instructor in French, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. [32 Crescent St.]
- Penniman, Josiah Harmar, Professor of English Literature and Dean of the College, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Perrin, Ernest Noël, Instructor in English, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [Harvard Union, Cambridge, Mass.]
- Perrin, Marshall Livingston, Professor of Germanic Languages, Boston University, 688 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.
- Perring, Roy Henderson, Professor of Modern Languages, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia. [916 Sixth Ave.]
- Perry, Bliss, Professor of English Literature, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [5 Clement Circle.]
- Pettengill, Ray Waldron, Instructor in German, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [21 Conant Hall.]
- Phelps, William Lyon, Professor of English Literature, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- Phillips, Marvin William, Instructor in Foreign Languages, Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College, Agricultural College, Miss.
- Pierce, Frederick Erastus, Instructor in English, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [622 Washington Ave., West Haven, Conn.]
- Plimpton, George A., Ginn & Co., New York, N. Y. [70 Fifth Ave.]
- Poll, Max, Professor of German, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
- Pope, Paul Russel, Assistant Professor of German, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. [Cayuga Heights.]
- Potter, Albert K., Associate Professor of the English Language, Brown University, Providence, R. I. [220 Waterman St.]
- Potter, Frances Boardman Squire, Professor of English, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. [2412 Harriet Ave.]
- Potter, Murray A., Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [191 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.]
- Pound, Louise, Associate Professor of English Literature, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. [1632 L St.]
- Pratt, Sarah M., Head of English Department, Central High School, Springfield, Mass.

- Prettyman, Cornelius William, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.
- Priest, George Madison, Preceptor in Modern Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Primer, Sylvester, Professor of Germanic Languages, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. [2709 Rio Grande St.]
- Putnam, Edward Kirby, Acting Director, Davenport Academy of Sciences, Davenport, Iowa.
- Putzker, Albin, Professor of German Literature, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
- Pyre, James Francis Augustine, Assistant Professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [625 Mendota Court.]
- Quinn, Arthur Hobson, Professor of English, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Raggio, Andrew Paul, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, University of Maine, Orono, Me.
- Ramsay, Robert Lee, Instructor in English, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
- Rankin, James Walter, Acting Professor of English, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
- Ransmeier, John Christian, Assistant Professor of German, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
- Raschen, John Frederick Lewis, Professor of the Germanic Languages and their Literature, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
- Ravenel, Mrs. Florence Leftwich, Biltmore, N. C.
- Ray, John Arthur, Instructor in Romance Languages, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. [Hotel Maryland.]
- Reed, Albert Granberry, Professor of English Literature, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.
- Reed, Edward Bliss, Assistant Professor of English Literature, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [Yale Station.]
- Reed, Frank Otis, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [401 Wisconsin Ave.]
- Reeves, William Peters, Professor of the English Language and Literature, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
- Reichmann, Charlotte Louise, Instructor in German, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. [2 River Terrace.]
- Reinhard, Eugen, Instructor in German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [1713 Adams St.]
- Remy, Alfred, Instructor in Modern Languages, Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. [Box 13, Bronxville, N. Y.]
- Remy, Arthur Frank Joseph, Adjunct Professor of Germanic Philology, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

- Rendtorff, Karl G., Assistant Professor of German, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal. [1130 Bryant St.]
- Rennert, Hugo Albert, Professor of Romanic Languages and Literatures, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. [4408 Chestnut St.]
- Rhoades, Lewis A., Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
- Rice, Carl Cosmo, Moscow, Idaho. [418 B St.]
- Rice, John Pierpont, Instructor in French, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [77 Elm St.]
- Richards, Alfred Ernest, Instructor in German, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [29 Alexander St.]
- Riemer, Guido Carl Leo, Professor of Modern Languages, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
- Robbins, Frederick Oscar, Instructor in French, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [215 Livingston St.]
- Robertson, James Alexander, Historical Editor, State Historical Library, Madison, Wis. [2431 E. 59th St., S. E., Cleveland, O.]
- Robertson, Luanna, Head of the German Department, High School of the School of Education of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [Kelly Hall, University of Chicago.]
- Robinson, Fred Norris, Professor of English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [Longfellow Park.]
- Robinson, Grace Louise, Rensselaer, N. Y. [14 Catharine St.]
- Roedder, Edwin Carl, Assistant Professor of Germanic Philology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [412 Lake St.]
- Root, Robert Kilburn, Preceptor in English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Rosenthal, Daniel Crehange, New York, N. Y. [Care of S. Samuels, 515 W. 134th St.]
- Roulston, Robert Bruce, Instructor in German, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. [1613 Madison Ave.]
- Roux, Louis Alexandre, Master in French and Latin, Newark Academy, Newark, N. J. [544 High St.]
- Royster, James Finch, Associate Professor of English, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
- Rumsey, Olive, Westfield, Chautauqua Co., N. Y.
- Ruutz-Rees, Caroline, Head Mistress, Rosemary Hall, Greenwich, Conn.
- Sachs, Julius, Professor of Secondary Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- de Salvio, Alfonso, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. [2019 Orrington Ave.]

- Sampson, Martin Wright, Acting Professor of English Literature, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Sanderson, Robert Louis, Assistant Professor of French, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- Sandison, Helen Estabrook, European Fellow in English, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. [American Express Co., 5 Haymarket, Pall Mall, London.]
- Saunders, Mrs. Mary J. T., Professor Emeritus of Modern Languages, Randolph-Macon Women's College, Lynchburg, Va. [7 Lowell St., Cambridge, Mass.]
- Schelling, Felix E., Professor of English Literature, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. [College Hall, University of Pennsylvania.]
- Schevill, Rudolph, Assistant Professor of the Spanish Language and Literature, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [Yale Station.]
- Schilling, Hugo Karl, Professor of the German Language and Literature, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. [2316 Le Conte Ave.]
- Schinz, Albert, Associate Professor of French Literature, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
- Schlatter, Edward Bunker, Instructor in Romance Languages, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [216 Brooks St.]
- Schlenker, Carl, Professor of German, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. [422 Union St., S. E.]
- Schmidt, Friedrich Georg Gottlob, Professor of the German Language and Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
- Schmidt, Gertrud Charlotte, Head of the German Department, Miss Wright's School, Bryn Mawr, Pa. [66 Denbigh Hall, Bryn Mawr College.]
- Schmidt, Meta, Scholar in German, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. [106 Fairchild St.]
- Schofield, William Henry, Professor of Comparative Literature, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [101 Brattle St.]
- Scholl, John William, Instructor in German, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [917 Forest Ave.]
- Schradieck, Helen Elizabeth, Brooklyn, N. Y. [535 Washington Ave.]
- Schreiber, Carl F., Instructor in German, New York University, New York, N. Y. [University Heights, Box 106.]
- Scott, Charles Payson Gurley, Editor, Yonkers, N. Y. [150 Woodworth Ave.]
- Scott, Fred Newton, Professor of Rhetoric, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [539 E. University Ave.]
- Scott, Mary Augusta, Professor of the English Language and Literature, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

- Sechrist, Frank Kleinfelter, Professor of English, State Normal School, Stevens Point, Wis. [934 Clark St.]
- Segall, Jacob Bernard, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Maine, Orono, Me.
- Semple, Lewis B., Teacher of English, Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. [229 Jefferson Ave.]
- Severy, Ernest E., Head of Department of English, Surigao Provincial High School, Surigao, P. I.
- Seymour, Arthur Romeyn, Associate in Spanish, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [909 Nevada St.]
- Seymour, Clara Gertrude, Teacher of English, Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis. [201 Ninth St.]
- Shackford, Martha Hale, Associate Professor of English Literature, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. [18 Abbott St.]
- Shanks, Lewis Piaget, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
- Shannon, Edgar Finley, Professor of English, University of Arkansas. [1593 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass.]
- Sharp, Robert, Professor of English, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
- Shaw, James Eustace, Associate in Italian, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
- Shearin, Hubert Gibson, Professor of English Philology, Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky.
- Sheldon, Edward Stevens, Professor of Romance Philology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [11 Francis Ave.]
- Shepard, William Pierce, Professor of Romance Languages, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
- Sherman, Lucius A., Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
- Sherman, Stuart Pratt, Assistant Professor of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- Sherzer, Jane, President and Professor of English, Oxford College for Women, Oxford, O.
- Shillock, Anna Felicia, Senior German Teacher, East Minneapolis High School, Minneapolis, Minn. [425 Twelfth Ave., S. E.]
- Shipherd, Henry Robinson, Francis W. Parker School, 550 Webster Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Shumway, Daniel Bussier, Professor of German Philology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Shute, Henry Martin, Instructor in German, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
- Sicard, Ernest, Teacher of French, Robert A. Waller High School, Chicago, Ill.

- Sills, Kenneth Charles Morton, Professor of Latin, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
- Simonds, William Edward, Professor of English Literature, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.
- Simonton, James S., Professor Emeritus of the French Language and Literature, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.
- Skinner, Macy Millmore, Assistant Professor of German, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal.
- Skinner, Prescott O., Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Sloane, Thomas O'Connor, Consulting Engineer and Chemist, South Orange, N. J.
- Smith, C. Alphonso, Professor of English, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
- Smith, Edward Laurence, Professor of Modern Languages, Delaware College, Newark, Del.
- Smith, Florence Mary, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [418 W. 118th St.]
- Smith, Frank Clifton, Gurleyville, Conn.
- Smith, Hugh Allison, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- Smith, Reed, Instructor in English, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
- Smith, Winifred, Meadville, Pa. [608 Chestnut St.]
- Smyser, William Emory, Professor of English, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.
- Snavely, Guy Everett, Professor of French and Registrar, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
- Snow, William Brackett, Head of the Department of Modern Languages, English High School, Boston, Mass.
- Snyder, Henry Nelson, President and Professor of English Literature, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
- Spaeth, J. Duncan, Preceptor in English, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Spaeth, Sigmund G., Preceptor in German, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Spalding, Mary Caroline, Instructor in English, Misses Shipley's School, Bryn Mawr, Pa. [Rockefeller Hall, Bryn Mawr College.]
- Spanhoofd, Arnold Werner, Head of the Modern Language Department in the High and Manual Training Schools, Washington, D. C. [2015 Hillyer Place, N. W.]
- Spanhoofd, Edward, Head of the Department of German, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.

- Speranza, Carlo Leonardo, Professor of Italian, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [120 E. 86th St.]
- Spiers, Alexander Guy Holborn, Instructor in Romance Languages, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
- Spingarn, Joel Elias, Professor of Comparative Literature, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [9 W. 73d St.]
- Stathers, Madison, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
- van Steenderen, Frederic C. L., Professor of the French Language and Literature, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.
- Steeves, Harrison Ross, Tutor in English, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [596 Riverside Drive.]
- Stempel, Guido Hermann, Associate Professor of Comparative Philology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
- Sterling, Susan Adelaide, Assistant Professor of German, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [109 W. Washington Ave.]
- Stern, Leo, Assistant Superintendent of Public Schools, Milwaukee, Wis. [City Hall.]
- Stevens, Alice Porter, Associate Professor of German, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
- Stewart, Morton Collins, Instructor in German, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [22 Mt. Auburn St.]
- Stewart, William Kilborne, Instructor in German, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Stoddard, Francis Hovey, Professor of the English Language and Literature, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. [22 West 68th St.]
- Stoll, Elmer Edgar, Assistant Professor of English, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.
- Stowell, William Averill, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
- Strauss, Louis A., Junior Professor of English, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [900 Lincoln Ave.]
- Stroebe, Lilian L., Instructor in German, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- Strunk, William, Jr., Professor of the English Language and Literature, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Stuart, Donald Clive, Instructor in Modern Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [Western Way.]
- Sturtevant, Albert Morey, Instructor in Germanic Languages, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas. [931 Louisiana St.]
- Sutton, S. Helena, Principal, Haverford Friends' School, Haverford, Pa. [Bryn Mawr, Pa.]

- van Sweringen, Grace Fleming, Professor of the German Language and Literature, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. [1104 University Ave.]
- Swiggett, Glen Levin, Professor of Modern Languages, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
- Sykes, Frederick Henry, Professor of English and Director of Extension Teaching, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Sypherd, Wilbur Owen, Professor of English and Political Sciences, Delaware College, Newark, Del.
- Tatlock, John Strong Perry, Junior Professor of English, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Taylor, Joseph Russell, Professor of English, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
- Taylor, Lucien Edward, Boston, Mass. [9 Haviland St., Suite 8.]
- Taylor, Marion Lee, Lake Erie College, Painesville, O.
- Taylor, Robert Longley, Assistant Professor of French, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Telleen, John Martin, Associate Professor of English, Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, O.
- Thayer, Harvey Waterman, Preceptor in German, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.
- Thieme, Hugo Paul, Junior Professor of French, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [735 S. 12th St.]
- Thomas, Calvin, Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Thomas, Daniel Lindsey, Danville, Ky.
- Thomas, May, Assistant Professor of German, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. [162 Fourteenth Ave.]
- Thompson, Elbert N. S., Assistant Professor of English Literature, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. [121 N. Van Buren St.]
- Thompson, Guy Andrew, Assistant Professor of English, University of Maine, Orono, Me.
- Thorndike, Ashley Horace, Professor of English, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Thorstenberg, Edward, Instructor in German, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- Thurber, Charles H., Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass. [29 Beacon St.]
- Thurber, Edward Allen, Instructor in English, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
- Tilley, Morris Palmer, Assistant Professor of English, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [924 Baldwin Ave.]

- Tinker, Chauncey B., Assistant Professor of English, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [38 Vanderbilt Hall.]
- Tisdell, Frederick Monroe, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Toledo, Toledo, O. [202 W. Delaware Ave.]
- Todd, Henry Alfred, Professor of Romance Philology, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Todd, T. W., Professor of German, Washburn College, Topeka, Kas.
- Tolman, Albert Harris, Associate Professor of English Literature, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Tombo, Rudolph, Jr., Alumni Secretary and Adjunct Professor of the Germanic Languages and Literatures, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Tombo, Rudolf, Sr., Instructor in German, Alcuin School, New York, N. Y. [321 St. Nicholas Ave.]
- Toy, Walter Dallam, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
- Trent, William Peterfield, Professor of English Literature, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [*The Churchman*, Lafayette Place.]
- Truscott, Frederick W., Professor of Germanic Languages, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
- Tufts, James Arthur, Professor of English, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
- Tupper, Frederick, Jr., Professor of the English Language and Literature, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
- Tupper, James Waddell, Professor of English Literature, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. [128 Burke St.]
- Turk, Milton Haight, Professor of Rhetoric and the English Language and Literature, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, N. Y. [678 Main St.]
- Turrell, Charles Alfred, Professor of Modern Languages, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.
- Tuttle, Edwin Hotchkiss, New Haven, Conn. [217 Mansfield St.]
- Tweedie, William Morley, Professor of the English Language and Literature, Mount Allison College, Sackville, N. B.
- Tynan, Joseph Lawrence, Tutor in English, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [1781 Sedgwick Ave.]
- Umphrey, George Wallace, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
- Underwood, Charles Marshall, Jr., Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, Simmons College, Boston, Mass. [13 Felton Hall, Cambridge, Mass.]
- Upham, Alfred Horatio, Professor of the English Language and Literature, Miami University, Oxford, O. [314 E. Church St.]

- Utter, Robert Palfrey, Associate Professor of English, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
- Vaughan, Herbert H., Instructor in French and German, Trinity College, Durham, N. C.
- Viles, George Burrbridge, Care of Dr. C. A. Viles, Lowell, Mass. [855 Bridge St.]
- Vogel, Frank, Professor of Modern Languages, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass. [95 Robinwood Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass.]
- Vos, Bert John, Professor of German, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
- Voss, Ernst Karl Johann Heinrich, Professor of German Philology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [218 Gilman St.]
- Vreeland, Williamson UpDike, Professor of Romance Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
- Wahl, George Moritz, Professor of the German Language and Literature, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
- Wallace, Malcolm William, Lecturer in English, University College, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.
- Walter, Hermann, Professor of Modern Languages, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Walz, John Albrecht, Assistant Professor of the German Language and Literature, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [13½ Hilliard St.]
- Warren, Frederick Morris, Professor of Modern Languages, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- Wauchope, George Armstrong, Professor of English, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
- Weber, Hermann J., Instructor in German, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [43 Lexington Ave.]
- Weber, William Lander, President and Professor of English, Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport, La.
- Webster, Kenneth G. T., Instructor in English, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [19 Ash St.]
- Weeks, Raymond, Professor of Romance Languages, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
- Weill, Félix, Instructor in French, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [424 W. 146 St.]
- Weiss, Henry, U. S. Government Interpreter and Translator, Port Townsend, Wash. [Box 63.]
- Wells, Edgar H., General Secretary, Harvard Alumni Association, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [52 Brattle St.]

- Wells, Henry Morse, Assistant Instructor in French, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Wells, John Edwin, Professor of English Literature, Hiram College, Hiram, O.
- Wells, Leslie C., Instructor in French and Spanish, Clark College, Worcester, Mass.
- Wernaer, Robert Maximilian, Cambridge, Mass. [8 Prescott St.]
- Werner, Adolph, Professor of the German Language and Literature, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [339 W. 29th St.]
- Wesselhoeft, Edward Karl, Assistant Professor of German, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. [College Hall, University of Pennsylvania.]
- West, Henry Titus, Professor of German, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
- Weston, George Benson, Instructor in Romance Languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [2 Gannett House.]
- Weygandt, Cornelius, Assistant Professor of English, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Weyhe, Hans, Associate in German, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
- Wharey, James Blanton, Professor of English, George Peabody College, for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn. [30 Clarendon Flats.]
- Whitcomb, Rupert Henry, Director of Music, Cathedral School of St. Paul, Garden City, N. Y.
- Whitcomb, Selden Lincoln, Associate Professor of English Literature, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kas. [1026 Ohio St.]
- White, Alain C., New York, N. Y. [51 E. 57th St.]
- White, Horatio Stevens, Professor of German, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [29 Reservoir St.]
- Whitelock, George, Counsellor at Law, Baltimore, Md. [1407 Continental Trust Building.]
- Whiteside, Donald Grant, Instructor in English, College of the City of New York, 138th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Whitman, Charles Huntington, Associate Professor of English, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. [189 College Ave.]
- Whitney, Marian P., Professor of German, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- Whittem, Arthur Fisher, Instructor in Romance Languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [23 Woodbridge St.]
- Whoriskey, Richard, Professor of Modern Languages, New Hampshire College, Durham, N. H.
- Wiehr, Josef, Instructor in German, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

- Wightman, John Roaf, Professor of Romance Languages, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.
- Wilkens, Frederick H., Assistant Professor of German, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.
- Wilkins, Ernest Hatch, Instructor in Romance Languages, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [58 Shepard St.]
- Williams, Charles Allyn, Instructor in German, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [611 W. Green St.]
- Wilson, Charles Bundy, Professor of the German Language and Literature, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.
- Winchester, Caleb Thomas, Professor of English Literature, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
- Winkler, Max, Professor of the German Language and Literature, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Wischkaemper, Richard, Instructor in German, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. [Faculty Box 70.]
- Wolff, Samuel Lee, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [311 W. 94th St.]
- Wood, Francis Asbury, Assistant Professor of Germanic Philology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Wood, Henry, Professor of German, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. [109 North Ave., W.]
- Woods, Charles F., Instructor in Modern Languages, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa. [22 S. High St., Bethlehem, Pa.]
- Wright, Arthur Silas, Professor of Modern Languages, Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, O.
- Wright, Charles Baker, Professor of English Literature and Rhetoric, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
- Wright, Charles Henry Conrad, Assistant Professor of French, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
- Wylie, Laura Johnson, Professor of English, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- Young, Bert Edward, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
- Young, Karl, Assistant Professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
- Young, Mary V., Professor of Romance Languages, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
- Zdanowicz, Casimer Douglass, Instructor in Romance Languages, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. [1818 Madison St.]
- Zembrod, Alfred Charles, Professor of Modern Languages, Kentucky State University, Lexington, Ky. [456 W. 4th St.]

LIBRARIES

SUBSCRIBING FOR THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

- Albany, N. Y.: New York State Library.
 Amherst, Mass.: Amherst College Library.
 Ann Arbor, Mich.: General Library of the University of Michigan.
 Aurora, N. Y.: Wells College Library.
 Austin, Texas: Library of the University of Texas.
 Baltimore, Md.: Enoch Pratt Free Library.
 Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Library.
 Baltimore, Md.: Library of the Peabody Institute.
 Baltimore, Md.: Woman's College Library.
 Beloit, Wis.: Beloit College Library.
 Berkeley, Cal.: Library of the University of California.
 Berlin, Germany: Englisches Seminar der Universität Berlin. [Doro-
 theenstrasse 5.]
 Blacksburg, Va.: Library of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
 Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Library.
 Boston, Mass.: Public Library of the City of Boston.
 Boulder, Col.: Library of the University of Colorado.
 Brooklyn, N. Y.: Adelphi College Library.
 Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr College Library.
 Buffalo, N. Y.: Buffalo Public Library.
 Burlington, Vt.: Library of the University of Vermont.
 Cambridge, England: University Library.
 Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Library.
 Cambridge, Mass.: Radcliffe College Library.
 Chapel Hill, N. C.: Library of the University of North Carolina.
 Charlottesville, Va.: Library of the University of Virginia.
 Chicago, Ill.: General Library of the University of Chicago.
 Chicago, Ill.: Newberry Library.
 Cincinnati, Ohio: Library of the University of Cincinnati. [Burnet
 Woods Park.]
 Cleveland, Ohio: Adelbert College Library.
 Collegeville, Pa.: Ursinus College Library.

- Columbia, Mo.: Library of the University of Missouri.
Concord, N. H.: New Hampshire State Library.
Crawfordsville, Ind.: Wabash College Library.
Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Library.
Detroit, Mich.: The Public Library.
Easton, Pa.: Van Wickle Memorial Library, Lafayette College.
Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Library.
Giessen, Germany: Die Grossherzogliche Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Graz, Austria: K. K. Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Greensboro, Ala.: Library of Southern University.
Halifax, Nova Scotia: Dalhousie College Library.
Hartford, Conn.: Watkinson Library.
Hiroshima, Japan: Hiroshima-Koto-Shihan-Gakko (Higher Normal School).
Iowa City, Iowa: Library of the State University of Iowa.
Irvington, Ind.: Butler College Library.
Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Library.
Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Library.
Lincoln Neb.: University of Nebraska Library.
Leipzig, Germany: Universitäts-Bibliothek.
London, England: London Library. [St. James Square, S. W.]
Lyons, France: Bibliothèque de l'Université. [18 quai Claude Bernard.]
Madison, Wis.: Library of the University of Wisconsin.
Madrid, Spain: Junta para Ampliacion de Estudios en el Estranjero. [Plaza de Bilbao 6.]
Middlebury, Vt.: Middlebury College Library.
Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Library.
Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Library.
Missoula, Mont.: University of Montana Library.
Munich, Germany: Königliche Hof- und Staats-Bibliothek.
Nashville, Tenn.: Library of the Peabody College of Teachers.
Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Library.
New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Library.
New York, N. Y.: Columbia University Library.
New York, N. Y.: New York Public Library (Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations). [425 Lafayette St.]
Oberlin, O.: Oberlin College Library.
Painesville, O.: Library of Lake Erie College.
Peoria, Ill.: Peoria Public Library.
Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Library.
Pittsburgh, Pa.: Carnegie Library.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.: Library of Vassar College.
Princeton, N. J.: Library of Princeton University.

Providence, R. I.: Library of Brown University.
 Providence, R. I.: Providence Public Library. [Washington St.]
 Reno, Nev.: University Library.
 Rochester, N. Y.: Library of the University of Rochester. [Prince St.]
 Rock Hill, S. C.: Winthrop Normal and Industrial College Library.
 Sacramento, Cal.: State Library of California.
 St. Louis, Mo.: Library of Washington University.
 St. Paul, Minn.: St. Paul Public Library.
 Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Library.
 South Bethlehem, Pa.: Lehigh University Library.
 Stanford University, Cal.: Leland Stanford Jr. University Library.
 Swarthmore, Pa.: Swarthmore College Reading Room.
 Syracuse, N. Y.: Library of Syracuse University.
 Urbana, Ill.: Library of the University of Illinois. [University
 Station.]
 Wellesley, Mass.: Wellesley College Reading Room Library.
 West Point, N. Y.: Library of the U. S. Military Academy.
 Williamstown, Mass.: Free Public Library.
 Worcester, Mass.: Free Public Library.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

ALESSANDRO D'ANCONA, University of Pisa.
K. VON BAHDER, University of Leipzig.
HENRY BRADLEY, Oxford, England.
ALOIS L. BRANDL, University of Berlin.
W. BRAUNE, University of Heidelberg.
KONRAD BURDACH, University of Berlin.
WENDELIN FOERSTER, University of Bonn.
F. J. FURNIVALL, London, England.
GUSTAV GRÖBER, University of Strassburg.
OTTO JESPERSEN, University of Copenhagen.
FR. KLUGE, University of Freiburg.
EUGENE KÜHNEMANN, University of Breslau.
MARCELINO MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, Madrid, Spain.
PAUL MEYER, école des Chartes, Paris, France.
W. MEYER-LÜBKE, University of Vienna.
JAKOB MINOR, University of Vienna.
JAMES A. H. MURRAY, Oxford, England.
ARTHUR NAPIER, University of Oxford.
FRITZ NEUMANN, University of Heidelberg.
ADOLF NOREEN, University of Upsala.
FRANCESCO NOVATI, University of Milan.
FRANCESCO D'OVIDIO, University of Naples.
H. PAUL, University of Munich.
PIO RAJNA, Florence, Italy.
AUGUST SAUER, University of Prague.
J. SCHIPPER, University of Vienna.
ERICH SCHMIDT, University of Berlin.
H. SCHUCHARDT, University of Graz.
EDUARD SIEVERS, University of Leipzig.
W. W. SKEAT, University of Cambridge.
JOHAN STORM, University of Christiania.
H. SUCHIER, University of Halle.
HENRY SWEET, Oxford, England.
ANTOINE THOMAS, Sorbonne, Paris.
ADOLF TOBLER, University of Berlin.
RICHARD PAUL WÜLKER, University of Leipzig.

ROLL OF MEMBERS DECEASED.

- J. T. AKERS, Central College, Richmond, Ky.
 GRAZIADIO I. ASCOLI, Milan, Italy. [1907.]
 ELYSÉE AVIRAGNET, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. [1908.]
 T. WHITING BANCROFT, Brown University, Providence, R. I. [1890.]
 D. L. BARTLETT, Baltimore, Md. [1899.]
 GEORGE ALONZO BARTLETT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 [1908.]
 W. M. BASKERVILL, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. [1899.]
 ALEXANDER MELVILLE BELL, Washington, D. C. [1905.]
 A. A. BLOOMBERGH, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. [1906.]
 DANIEL G. BRINTON, Media, Pa. [1899.]
 SOPHUS BUGGE, University of Christiania. [1907.]
 FRANK ROSCOE BUTLER, Hathorne, Mass. [1905.]
 GEORGE RICE CARPENTER, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
 [1909.]
 JOSEPH W. CARR, University of Maine, Orono, Me. [1909.]
 CHARLES CHOLLET, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
 [1903.]
 HENRY COHEN, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. [1900.]
 WILLIAM COOK, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [1888.]
 SUSAN R. CUTLER, Chicago, Ill. [1899.]
 A. N. VAN DAELL, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston,
 Mass. [1899.]
 EDWARD GRAHAM DAVES, Baltimore, Md. [1894.]
 W. DEUTSCH, St. Louis, Mo. [1898.]
 ERNEST AUGUST EGGERS, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. [1903.]
 FRANCIS R. FAVA, Columbian University, Washington, D. C. [1896.]
 L. HABEL, Norwich University, Northfield, Vermont. [1886.]
 B. P. HASDEU, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Roumania. [1908.]
 RUDOLF HAYM, University of Halle. [1901.]
 RICHARD HEINZEL, University of Vienna. [1905.]
 GEORGE A. HENCH, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 [1899.]
 JOHN BELL HENNEMAN, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
 [1908.]
 RUDOLF HILDEBRAND, Leipzig, Germany. [1894.]

- JULES ADOLPHE HOBIGAND, Boston, Mass. [1906.]
JULIAN HUGUENIN, University of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La. [1901.]
ANDREW INGRAHAM, Cambridge, Mass. [1905.]
J. KARGÉ, Princeton College, Princeton, N. J. [1892.]
GUSTAF E. KARSTEN, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. [1908.]
F. L. KENDALL, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. [1893.]
PAUL OSCAR KERN, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [1908.]
EUGEN KÖLBING, Breslau, Germany. [1899.]
J. LÉVY, Lexington, Mass.
AUGUST LODEMAN, Michigan State Normal School, Ypsilanti, Mich. [1902.]
JULES LOISEAU, New York, N. Y.
JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, Cambridge, Mass. [1891.]
J. LUQUIENS, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [1899.]
ALBERT BENEDICT LYMAN, Baltimore, Md. [1907.]
THOMAS McCABE, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. [1891.]
J. G. R. McELBOY, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. [1891.]
EDWARD T. McLAUGHLIN, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [1893.]
EDWARD H. MAGILL, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. [1907.]
LOUIS EMIL MENGER, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. [1903.]
CHARLES WALTER MESLOH, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. [1904.]
SAMUEL P. MOLENAER, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. [1900.]
JAMES O. MURRAY, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. [1901.]
ADOLF MUSSAFIA, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. [1905.]
BENNETT HUBBARD NASH, Boston, Mass. [1906.]
C. K. NELSON, Brookville, Md. [1890.]
W. N. NEVIN, Lancaster, Pa. [1892.]
WILLIAM WELLS NEWELL, Cambridge, Mass. [1907.]
CONRAD H. NORDBY, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. [1900.]
C. P. OTIS, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass. [1888].
GASTON PARIS, Collège de France, Paris, France. [1903.]
W. H. PERKINSON, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. [1898.]
HERBERT T. POLAND, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [1906.]
SAMUEL PORTER, Gallaudet College, Kendall Green, Washington, D. C. [1901.]
F. YORK POWELL, University of Oxford, Oxford, England. [1904.]
RENÉ DE POYEN-BELLISLE, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. [1900.]

- THOMAS R. PRICE, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. [1903.]
 HENRY B. RICHARDSON, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. [1906.]
 CHARLES H. ROSS, Agricultural and Mechanical College, Auburn,
 Ala. [1900.]
 M. SCHELE DE VERE, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
 [1898.]
 O. SEIDENSTICKER, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 [1894.]
 JAMES W. SHERIDAN, College of the City of New York, New York,
 N. Y.
 MAX SOHBAUER, New York, N. Y.
 F. R. STENGEL, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
 CAROLINE STRONG, Portland, Ore. [1908.]
 H. TALLICHET, Austin, Texas. [1894.]
 HIRAM ALBERT VANCE, University of Nashville, Nashville, Tenn.
 [1906.]
 E. L. WALTER, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. [1898.]
 KARL WEINHOLD, University of Berlin. [1901.]
 CLARA WENCKEBACH, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. [1902.]
 HÉLÈNE WENCKEBACH, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. [1888.]
 MARGARET M. WICKHAM, Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y. [1898.]
 R. H. WILLIS, Chatham, Va. [1900.]
 CASIMIR ZDANOWICZ, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. [1889.]
 JULIUS ZUPITZA, Berlin, Germany. [1895.]
-

REGULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

1. Members wishing to present papers at the meeting are expected to prepare them for that particular purpose. Extremely technical treatises may be read by title. Subjects too large to be treated in an ordinary paper, and topics too special to be of general interest, may be brought before the meeting in the form of abstracts lasting from five to ten minutes. The papers read in full should be so constructed as not to occupy more than twenty (or, at most, thirty) minutes.

2. Every member offering a paper, whether it is to be read in full or not, shall submit to the Secretary, by November 15, with its title, a synopsis of its contents, consisting of some fifty or sixty words. He shall state, at the same time, whether he thinks his paper should be presented by title only, summarized in an abstract, or read in full. The synopses of accepted papers are to be printed on the program.

3. The Secretary shall select the program from the papers thus offered, trying to distribute the matter in such a way as to make all the sessions attractive. In general not more than an hour and a half shall be devoted to the presentation of papers at any one session. There shall be sufficient opportunity for discussion and for social intercourse.

4. The question of publication is to be decided for each paper on its merits as a contribution to science, without regard to the form in which it has been presented at the meeting.

NOTICE.

The Editorial Committee desires additional copies of Vol. xvii, No. 4, New Series, Vol. x, No. 4, and will pay 75 cents for any copy of that number addrest to the Treasurer, Mr. W. G. HOWARD, 25 CONANT HALL, *Cambridge, Mass.*

OFFICERS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICA FOR THE YEAR 1909.

President, MARION DEXTER LEARNED, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Secretary, C. H. GRANDGENT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

*Treasurer, WILLIAM GUILD HOWARD, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.,
Acting Secretary from July 10, 1909, to August 1, 1910.*

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

GUSTAV GRUENER, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

EVERETT WARD OLMSTED, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CENTRAL DIVISION.

Chairman, ARTHUR GRAVES CANFIELD, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Secretary, CHARLES BUNDY WILSON, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

AICÉE FORTIER, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.

CHARLES HARRIS, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

GEORGE HEMPL, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.

JOHN M. MANLY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

LEWIS F. MOTT, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

HENRY A. TODD, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

C. H. GRANDGENT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.

CALVIN THOMAS, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

JAMES W. BRIGHT, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

12-12-12

12-12-12

A FINE IS INCURRED IF THIS BOOK IS
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW.

STALL STUDY
CHARGE

